THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In the series of books on 'Current Problems' the latest is Sir Richard Livingstone's *Education for a World Adrift*.[1] The subject is urgently topical and surely no one could have been chosen to handle it who is more fully equipped to do so. We have all been indebted to Sir Richard's finely cultured mind, and in this little book we everywhere find that indefinable charm which seems to be the exclusive quality of the Hellenist.

The title fairly describes the contents of the book. There is a good deal about the 'world adrift.' Sir Richard describes our age as 'an age without standards.' It is an age in which the tares not only grow among the wheat but are not distinguished from it. 'Look at any issue of our cheap daily papers and you will see what I mean.' This is a tawdry world. In the last century England had a philosophy of life. Its leading men were all formed by Christianity or Hellenism or both. The nation had a common belief and common standard of conduct. The nineteenth century had a soul, a spirit. What soul has ours?

And quite logically to-day educationists are more taken up with educational machinery than with education. We are more concerned with providing schools than with what is to be taught in them. We want the raising of the school age, nursery schools, part-time continued education, adult study—all essential but not enough. As Plato said, the noblest of all studies is the study of what man should be and how he should live. This is the matter to which we do not give the attention it deserves.

But Sir Richard goes much further. We must impart knowledge in our schools. That is important, still more the power to use it. But most important of all is what a man believes, what he thinks good and bad, whether he has clear values and standards. Our education is like a half-assembled motor car; most of the parts are there but they are not put together. Reformers wish to base education on science and technology, or on sociology and economics. And they will produce a good chassis, but what is overlooked is the engine. The real problem lies deeper than science or sociology or politics; it is spiritual. In the past spiritual forces have done much to control and direct our country, but these forces have lost ground, and, in proportion as they lose it, life loses direction and purpose, and character becomes a habit whose roots are dead.

This might be said to be the burden of Sir Richard's book, the deep and urgent need for a religious foundation for education. He would include a philosophy of life which embraces Goodness, Truth, and Beauty. But 'philosophy passes into religion when these [values] are seen to point to and derive their validity from that ultimate spiritual reality which we call God.' The ideal education may be defined as follows: men must learn to earn a living, to be good members of a society, to understand the meaning of the phrase 'the good life'; and education must help them to achieve these three ends.

The teaching of this in schools raises the so-called problem of religious teaching. It is not too much to say that the spiritual future of this country depends on its right solution and on the solution being carried into practice. In the last nineteen centuries Christianity has been the greatest new fact in the history of Europe which is unintelligible without some knowledge of it. Incidentally, its book is both the finest monument of the English language and the greatest book in the world. Thus, some knowledge of Christianity must be given in education.

But that is not 'religious education.' Religious education is seeing Christianity as a way of living, as a life that was actually lived. The first and most important thing in it is the actual portrait, preserved in the Synoptic Gospels, of a carpenter's Son who, gathering some followers around Him, taught, healed, and lived His life in Palestine. To see Christ so is to see Him as His contemporaries saw Him in Galilee and in Judea during His earthly life; to see what convinced the men closest to Him and who knew Him best, that He was not an ordinary man but the Son of God, convincing them not as 'light half-believers of a

[1] Cambridge University Press; 3s. 6d. net.

casual creed' but so that they never hesitated for a moment to change their lives and to die for their conviction. The facts recorded in the Gospels do not exhaust Christianity, but they are the most important part of it. To expound these facts, though it is not to teach Christianity, is to give the premises for it.

This should lead to a knowledge of the Christian theory of life. The Life leads to the Creed. So it was in the history of Christianity, where the Creed was a late growth, a belief to which the actual experience of Christians led, and which embodied that experience but did not precede it. The Nicene Creed was formulated three hundred years after Christ's death; the Apostles' Creed is not earlier than the middle of the second century and received its final formulation much later. The individual should travel by the same road as the early Christian community; he should arrive at the Creed, not start from it; and it will mean infinitely more to him if he comes to it, as the early Christians did, as a rational account of facts which he knows and of an experience which he has had.

That, indeed, is the road by which most, if not all, people do travel; they come to accept the Creed because after living and thinking it seems to them the most rational account of the facts of history and of their own experience. That is the right process and the regular method in all education—first practice, then theory; first the facts, then the formulation of a principle to explain them.

This is not to say that we can at any stage dispense with dogma. Some dogma is inevitable. To say that the teaching of Jesus, or any of it, conveys the truth about life is a highly dogmatic statement, implying a very definite view of the universe and human nature. To say that the teaching is false or valueless is equally dogmatic; and it is also dogmatic to say that we cannot form an opinion on the matter but must suspend our judgment. Agnosticism, like theism or atheism, is dogmatic, and there is no credit, least of all any intellectual credit, in halting between two opinions, when in fact you must *act* as if one or the other were true. Agnosticism enables English intellectuals conscientiously to indulge in the national vice of keeping thought and action apart and concealing from the right hand what the left hand does.

How much dogma should be taught at school? Sir RICHARD quotes with approval a statement by Professor Reid of Newcastle, the substance of which is this: The nature and love of God have been completely embodied and revealed in the person, teaching, life and death of Christ. Not in His teaching only (Christianity can never be reduced to a code of ethics) but through His life and above all in His death in which we believe we are shown the very nature of God. That is the central dogma and it views reality not as material but as spiritual and in some sense eternal.

'But,' some one may object, 'these are the methods of Hitler. Your ideal may lead in a different direction, but it has the same character. You wish to form the childish mind, when it is powerless to resist, to impose a view of life upon it, to ignore its right to freedom.' This objection is hardly worth the powder and shot Sir RICHARD expends on it. But he makes the inevitable answer. 'When a critic speaks of the danger in forming the growing mind, I am inclined to ask him: "And you, do you not impose a view of life on your child? Do you allow him to grow up dirty in person and habits, greedy, cruel, a liar, an egoist living for himself? Do you say to him: some people think that might is right and that the strong should take what they can and the weak suffer what they must; others think that life is a quest for pleasure and that the wise man evades any duty to his state or his neighbour and tries to live tranquil and undisturbed with his friends: make up your mind on these points, I express no opinion about them"?'

'Do you bring him up to believe that there is no distinction between right and wrong? If so, are you not arbitrarily deciding the biggest of all questions? When you come to history, do you leave your child to suppose that Hitler is as good a model as Abraham Lincoln or that the champions of *laissez-faire* may be right and their opponents wrong? Judgments like these rest on a definite view of life. The fact is that the firmest believer in freedom moulds, or, if we prefer the phrase, tyrannizes over, the mind of the child and takes liberty from it in the cradle.'

There has not often been a more persuasive defence of teaching religion in the school as the basis of all true education. We have given a brief summary of Sir RICHARD'S argument. But it is to be fervently hoped that many people will buy this fine book, not only for its argument but for the joy of its style. It is a real gift.

We had pleasure in reviewing a year or two ago a thoughtful book on 'Christian Ethics' by Dr. Andrew R. OSBORN, a Presbyterian Minister who was born and educated in Australia and who has ministered in Australia, Canada, and the

United States. He has recently written another book, *Christianity in Peril*,[1] marked by the same solidity of treatment and simplicity of statement. The sub-title gives a clue to the subject-matter; it is, 'The New World Order and the Churches.'

Part I. treats of the Crisis in Christian Faith. If the challenge of the time is to be met, there must be, it is said, reformation within the churches; and the churches must become the moral and religious leaders of society. The Roman Catholic Church is too much bound by tradition to undertake such a rôle. Protestantism is not fettered in the same way, but it is sick and has lost initiative. Can it recover and become the dynamic leader which the times require?

Part II. treats of the Fundamentals of Christian Faith. The first step, it is said, toward spiritual recovery must be a restatement of the Faith in the thought-forms of the age; and the cardinal doctrines awaiting restatement are the reality of God, a redemptive process in history with its focus in the work of Christ, and the actuality of a future life. These doctrines may be restated in thought-forms which are in complete accord with the scientific world-view.

Part III. treats of the Coming Reformation. If Protestantism is to regain moral and religious leadership, certain changes are said to be needful. Its present outmoded methods of Christian propaganda and education must be scrapped. Its social action must be drastically reorganized. Its government and administration must also be drastically reorganized. Yet if Protestantism fails, God's purpose will not fail; reformation will come through another agency.

Let us look at the second of the three needful changes above tabulated. What has our author in view? His main reference under the head of social action is to the question of the ministry of healing.

There was a ministry of healing in the Early Church. We do not know to what extent it was practised, but it appears to have gone on side by side with the practice of medicine by professional physicians. The condemnation of medical science by the modern advocates of Christian Science is thus not in accord with the historic tradition of the Church. But spiritual healing might well be re-established in the Church as a department of Christian service, functioning as in the early days in co-operation with the medical profession.

[1] Milford; 11s. 6d. net.

General opinion in the Church seems to be against services of healing and healing missions as liable to do harm as well as good. But it is the special business of the Church to care for the souls of men, and every form of mental distress comes within its sphere in some way; and the Bible, the Sacraments, and prayer do not cover the whole field of ministration. Undoubtedly acute mental distress affects the body, and the minister might well help to mitigate or remove the mental condition.

If a minister has a knowledge of the fundamental ideas of psychiatry he gains a more ready insight into the nature of the mental ills which are often behind conduct, and may be able in such cases to give guidance. But it seems doubtful if more than this should be attempted. A clinic conducted by a minister having no careful scientific training might easily lead to grave errors in diagnosis and treatment. Cases would come before him which would require medical aid and possibly the services of a trained psychiatrist. The right thing is to link up the services of the medical profession with that of the care of souls.

'Many persons would make a better recovery if cure of the soul were joined with cure of the body. The cure of the soul comes definitely within the sphere of Church activity. Unfortunately this department has fallen into confusion in our modern age. If, however, men with vision, who realize that obsolete methods must be replaced by efficient ones, could re-establish it so that it would function once again in ways suited to modern life, the Church would enter upon a new great era of service to mankind.'

Not only has our author the 'cure' of souls in view, in the literal modern sense of the phrase, he has also the general 'care' of souls in view, as he advocates a new programme of social action on the part of the Church. More especially, he would urge the Church to enter upon a great field of activity as yet scarcely touched, that of the help and guidance of the child. He cites one Sunday School that had a little psychological laboratory of its own, in which mental and other tests were given, and emotional reactions noted by the use of the psychogalvanic reflex. He says that the value of knowledge of these emotional reactions was very great, seeing that emotions condition conduct; children were rescued who might otherwise have gone astray, and the interests and character-traits of all the scholars were discovered.

This surely is further than the ordinary Sunday School could go or would be justified in going. But there is much to be said for the general contention that systematic child-study should be considered an essential part of Sunday School work. And this should lead to the linking of the child to that branch of service in the Church for which he is best suited.

In his new book, *Taken at the Flood*,[1] Mr. Kenneth INGRAM makes a brave attempt at achieving a religious synthesis, a reconciliation between modern secularist humanism and traditional Christianity. To understand his purpose we must bear in mind where he himself stands. He is a whole-hearted Socialist, and the first part of his book is devoted to a singularly able argument for common ownership as the vital thing to be worked for. But common ownership is not merely an economic or political thing. It involves a new attitude to life. For it is not only the reconstruction of the post-war world that is at stake, but the manner in which we use our new world. And this social behaviour will be determined mainly by our personal motives, ideas, and intentions.

'In other words, the crucial test will be the character of the religion of the new age.' The driving force behind our task must be, Mr. INGRAM believes, no less than a religious inspiration. Therefore the crux of the whole matter is this: how will the religion of the new age arise, and what will be its nature? That is the question on which our national future chiefly, or perhaps wholly, depends. For the raw material of religion is precisely the relationships of human persons towards one another. And, unless there is a burning religious zeal to lay the foundation of a new world, as a nation we shall be swept into a backwater.

Mr. INGRAM is satisfied that neither traditional Christianity nor secular humanism is fit for this task. The former has obvious defects. It is theoretical and obscurantist. It is dogmatic and over-ready to accept a body of doctrine in outworn forms untested. It is because it belongs so largely to the realm of ideas that it has become discredited in the contemporary world. It is occupied with issues and dogmas that seem to modern men unreal because unrelated to life.

But secular humanism has even more profound weaknesses. One is a Utopian tendency which leads to the imagination that the sole task of the reformer is to build up a satisfactory economic organization, and that men and women will then respond to their environment. This must always be a vain hope. Something much deeper than the persuasions of economic doctrine has to stir the young generation if it is going to dedicate itself to the task of building a decent world. It is for this reason that the Labour Party at present fails to light that flame. Other defects of humanism are its lack of culture, which is always the fruit of religion, and its ignorance of what Christianity is.

Are these two opposites, then, irreconcilable? If we regard traditional Christianity (according to the Hegelian dialectic, which is so often verified in history) as Thesis, and Secular Humanism as Antithesis, is not a synthesis possible? Mr. Ingram believes it is. Moreover, he holds that the religion of the new age can legitimately be called Christian, for two reasons: (1) because it is the Christian tradition which has so deeply affected our national development, and (2) because Christianity is the religion most capable of universality, and the most intimate revelation of reality which has yet been unfolded in human history. But it must be a Christianity divorced from the imperfections of the past, not in the air but attached to reality, developed from experience, vivid with the flame of life and not conceived in the bloodless realm of ideas.

There are already within the churches not a few people who have thus wedded what is good in secular humanism—its practical sense, its fixed gaze on human facts, its feeling of the urgency of revolution—with what is good in traditional Christianity, and above all its attachment to the concrete factors in the ministry of Jesus. The source of the synthesis we are looking for is to be found in that body of Christian thought within the churches which finds itself in ever closer alliance with those who are trying to establish the new order, and those progressive humanitarian forces which are awakening to a religious consciousness precisely because of their activities in the political-social sphere.

Then comes the most interesting part of Mr. INGRAM'S book. He considers what the religion of the new age will make of three great Christian affirmations. Only the merest pointers can be given here. The first bears on the Divinity of Christ, and on this his conclusion is that a Christian conception of Christ will not be reached until it has been perceived that His own relationship to universal reality, to God, is so complete that He

[1] Allen & Unwin; 6s. net.

may be regarded as the manifestation of God. But Jesus reaches this not by argument. 'The claim of Jesus is precisely one that must be examined on the level of experience. It is the outcome of Jesus' own experience.'

And this is the way to God for us also. As Jesus reached His experience in the realm of persons, so must we. It is in our contact with persons that the experience of living is centred. It would not be untrue to Mr. INGRAM'S thought to say that in love to others we become one with universal reality.

And this points the way to a synthesis on the two other Christian affirmations—the future life and prayer. It will be the degree to which man attains unity with the spirit of life which determines whether he has himself the power to live beyond time. 'It may be that he can be so merged in reality that he himself survives in reality.' In other words, the way to a synthesis here is the same pragmatic way, a kind of Conditional Immortality. In regard to prayer also we find the truth in practice. Prayer must be regarded as co-operation with the universal purpose. 'Through prayer so conceived man is raising his attitude towards the universal reality into the intimacy of a personal relationship to God.'

This synthesis may seem to many not entirely satisfactory. But it is stimulating to see some one, who at the same time is a man of his age and clings to 'the truth as it is in Jesus,' bravely attempting not a compromise, for Mr. INGRAM would repudiate that, but a unity. As Frederick Robertson long ago taught, the truth is found not in a half way between two extremes but by putting the two extremes together.

Cults of Today.

II. The Heresy of Fatalism.

BY THE REVEREND CANON ROGER LLOYD, M.A., THE CLOSE, WINCHESTER.

EVERY great war sets a premium on one form or another of fatalistic doctrine. For Fatalism is at once an explosive and an anodyne; and when it is required of whole populations that on the one hand they shall be fierce and untameable and on the other that they shall be patient and enduring, a doctrinal interpretation of life which is capable of inculcating both sets of qualities at once is obviously very useful to the propagandists. That Fatalism has this double power is shown by both history and experience. The most fatalistic religions and races have always been the most militant, and even the most military. To believe that one's death, in date and manner, is inexorably predetermined, and that no amount of caution or playing for safety can alter one's fate by a hair's breadth, does demonstrably lend courage to the faint-hearted and endurance to the weary. In the conditions of modern war all people have a special need that just these qualities should be added to them, and that is why all wars are accompanied by an outcrop of astrological soothsaying, which is the disreputable charlatanry of Fatalism.

It is not only the ordinary soldiers and civilians who in war-time have special needs which Fatalism can supply. There are also governments and dictators. Their needs are akin to those of their peoples but are more subtle, so that Fatalism in its trivial form of astrology is not much use to them—though, as an exception, Hitler is said to lean heavily on a tame astrologist. But in its grander form of destinism, Fatalism can and often does hold up governments. The great needs of a government or a dictatorship in time of war are, in the spiritual sphere, two. It must bring itself to and maintain itself at the point where sincerely, wholeheartedly, and unshakeably it believes in the inevitability of its victory. Further, since in war and in the preparation for war dreadful things have to be done, and since nearly all human beings are moralists under their skins, it must have a deep belief in the righteousness of the cause it fights to serve, and also in the morality of the methods it uses to serve it. A sense of destiny will supply these needs; and destiny is Fatalism in its most majestic form.

Anybody who makes even a slight study of the speeches of militant dictators can see how useful a tool Fatalism is to them. Nearly always one intent of their speeches is to justify something—an act of aggression or some new atrocity—which on any ordinary standards of morality is unjusti-

fiable. They always use the same plea. They put the crime on the back of history, and they call history by the name of Destiny. They want to goad multitudes of quite ordinary young men into becoming brutes and devils. They do so by saying that the fulfilment of the nation's destiny requires an iron hardness. They want to justify the invasion of Russia, of China, or of Albania. They do it by invoking something that they call the Destiny of the Race. 'We do but follow the path which is laid down for us to walk in by destiny'—over and over again these words have been used. Undoubtedly this cloudy and vague imagery has some sort of pragmatic sanction; for it seems to work. The necessary atrocities are duly performed, and the natural consciences of the criminals are stifled. The spirits of the suffering people as a whole are uplifted, even exalted, and they will endure much. The idea of the destiny of the nation to be the rulers of the world has carried Japan to the gates of Australia and India, and Germany to the Atlantic and Mediterranean. In another sphere, the idea of the destiny of the proletariat to bestow upon the world the classless society has created the seeds of revolution in every country. The last ten years must have completely disposed of any doubts of the terrific force of destiny considered as an idea.

Fatalism, moreover, fits in with another element in human nature in that it is strongly mystical and mildly religious. It can, that is to say, appeal to the religious instinct by its strong sense of a power not confined to this world, but without making any inconvenient appeal to a self-forgetful morality of mercy, truth, and love. The symbols of the mysticism are nicely vague while not being completely meaningless. The appeals to Blood and Soil will not of course bear the logical weight which Dr. Rosenberg puts on them. But, on the other hand, they are not wholly non-sensible: both Blood and Soil have a real potency. Fatalism will even appeal to a divinity, though naturally this divinty is quite non-moral, and nearly non-active, as well. Names are found for him with more convenient associations than those attached to God. Sometimes they call him Fate or Destiny, sometimes History, but usually Providence. The convenient point to be urged, of course, is that a man need not be an atheist to become an orthodox fatalist. He may still have a deity, even if the deity is very dumb. But that deity is completely inconsistent with the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Both on its record and on its theory Fatalism must be declared a heresy and destroyed. But its destruction will not be easy; and we cannot even begin it until we have squarely faced the fact of the likenesses and the kinship between Fatalism and Christianity. To Christians, Fatalism is heretical; and a heresy is a perversion of some true element in the body of Christian teaching, and not a completely opposed doctrine, false from start to finish. A fatalist and a Christian are concerned with the same problems and are using the same material. Both alike are struggling with the difficult relationship between Chance and Design in the historical scheme of things. Both are concerned to establish a link between our terrestrial lives and a Power not of this world, and to attribute to this Power the driving force of life. Destiny does not carry the same meaning for both, but the meaning it has for each is rich. This much of that meaning they hold in common, that there is a plan or pattern in the unfolding universe, and that every event falls within its scope. Christians, for example, are perfectly at home with the idea of the foreordained and destined victory of good over evil. We believe in it as a fixed, inherent necessity of things, as God's victory and not ours.

Yet in spite of all that wide field of agreement it is quite clear that Christianity must think of Fatalism as an enemy to be destroyed. Its record in the modern world, moreover, is such that it is the very breath of the devil, whose strategy it always is to hide within the good, and twist and spoil it. In terms of the existing theological situation, Fatalism is certainly Public Enemy Number One.

We have ready to our hands the weapon to take the sting out of Fatalism. It is the true, the Christian doctrine of Predestination. It is there for our use, but we may not find it readily usable simply because our hands have long been unaccustomed to touch it. It is certainly a pity, and it may have been a major disaster for the world, that Christians have for so many years shied away from what is after all one of the key doctrines of the New Testament. Without a working and accepted theory of Predestination Christians are disarmed when they have to stand up to the drive of Fatalism. The doctrine of Predestination has never been disowned by the Church: it is too deeply and inextricably embedded in the Scriptures for that. But it has become rare to hear it expounded. This probably is because we are all so anxious not again to get entangled in what Calvin and John Knox made of it. In their teaching it became something which it is unlikely that we shall again persuade Christians to accept. They thought of it as the declaration of the divinely appointed destiny of persons, and were apt to limit its operation to individuals and its direction to heaven and hell. Thus, from all eternity, it was supposed, God had destined some few persons to be saved and all

the rest to be condemned; and their merits were held to have but little, if they had anything, to do with their reward or their doom. This theory seemed to involve God in charges of gross favouritism, and the efforts of its supporters to show that God could so arrange things and yet be just, did not carry conviction. No doubt this is a very crude and sketchy outline of the Calvinist theory of Predestination, and no doubt, again, that certain isolated verses in Romans and in the Fourth Gospel can bear such an interpretation. But say the word Predestination, and this is what most people think it means. So thinking, they will have nothing to do with it.

The pity of this is that they miss that point in the New Testament where there is a statement of the meaning of Predestination which is perfectly credible, on which it is possible to build an impregnable trust in God, and which, when worked out, is precisely what we are needing at this moment to counter the powerful destinism of the new religion of godlessness. This point comes of course in Ephesians, and the crucial passage is i. 10, 11, which, in Moffatt's translation, runs:

> [God] showing us how it was the purpose of his design so to order it [his will or plan] in the fulness of the ages that all things in heaven and earth alike should be gathered up in Christ—in the Christ in whom we have had our heritage allotted us (as was decreed in the design of him who carries out everything according to the counsel of his will).

When that is compared with the Authorized Version of the same passage, and both of them with the earlier and linked passage in i. 2–4, a doctrine of Predestination emerges which is not only credible but positively inevitable. What sort of a God would He be who had not a predetermined Grand Design for His creation to serve? Predestination in fact becomes an all-inclusive doctrine. It deals with the purpose and the fate of whole universes, and not only of individual persons. It means that nothing whatever that happens can fall outside God's plan in the sense of being irrelevant to it, or powerless to contribute to its fulfilment. There can, of course, be accidents which God did not plan: the recent London tube station disaster was such a one. There can also be defiances of His love which God did not will: what happens in a German concentration camp is such a defiance. But these things, too, once done, fall within the scope of God's design, within the range of His redeeming power; and their consequences can be used to set forward the design as a whole. Moreover, in these passages the position of Christians in the predetermined scheme of things is cleared up. It says most truly that Christians have an allotted position in the design; but it does not say that this position is privileged, and still less that we occupy that position quite irrespective of our merits to do so. Indeed, the moral passages in Ephesians which follow seem to make it quite clear that we can only take our proper place in the plan of God if our behaviour admits us.

Now all that makes it clear that the proper answer to Fatalism is Predestination. There are true elements in Fatalism, and Predestination brings them out; it destroys the far greater number of false things. It is manifestly true that the universe moves towards a predetermined end and purpose; and true again that whether we serve God well or ill we cannot do more than hasten or retard that consummation. But Predestination emphatically and intelligibly asserts what Fatalism, especially in its current form of Destinism, denies. It leads us to trust God because He is an Energy actively immersed in His own creation: 'the help that is done upon earth, God doeth it Himself.' He brings in His own kingdom, and we can only help. And that leads us in turn to an energy just as devoted and far more lasting than anything which Fatalism can produce; those who believe most deeply in Predestination have always been those who laboured more abundantly than they all. It destroys any idea that God's plan can be served by methods which are clearly in opposition to the best that human beings can know about His will for righteousness. It is the true foundation of all freedom, for it alone puts the relationship between divine omnipotence and human freewill on a really credible basis. We shall not in fact be able to deal with the various forms of Fatalism, grand or trivial, which are at present plaguing us, merely by denouncing them, or even by pointing to their appalling results. We must have something better to put in its place, and the Ephesian doctrine of Predestination gives us what we want.

Literature.

THE SPIRITUAL GOSPEL.

'The spiritual Gospel' is coming into its own again. First, we had Hoskyns' theological commentary; then Dr. Temple's altogether admirable 'Readings'; and now Dr. W. F. Howard of Handsworth College, Birmingham, has published his Dale Lectures under the title of *Christianity according to St. John* (Duckworth; 6s. net).

This excellent summary of Johannine theology is a sequel to his previous book, 'The Fourth Gospel in Recent Criticism and Interpretation', which dealt chiefly with questions of introduction and provided a splendid summary of critical opinion on the Fourth Gospel during the last thirty odd years. In this second book next to nothing is said of authorship: after giving reasons for leaving the Apocalypse out of account and for his acceptance of the common authorship of the Fourth Gospel and the Johannine Epistles, Dr. Howard plunges straight into the theology, grouping it under the following heads: The Logos of Life; Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; Man, Sin, and Salvation; Eschatology and Mysticism; Church, Ministry, and Sacraments; Faith, Knowledge, and Love; The Way, the Truth, and the Life. An Epilogue, some additional Notes, and indices round off a book which will be a Godsend to the student who desires a brief and up-to-date summary of Johannine theology.

The best chapters in the book are iii. (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit), v. (Eschatology and Mysticism), and vi. (Church, Ministry, and Sacraments). Indeed, we know of no better summary in English of the Johannine eschatology than is provided in ch. v. where full justice is done to the work of Otto and C. H. Dodd. After citing the common opinion that 'John' is a mystic who has no use for eschatology proper, Dr. Howard shows that any just account of John's view must reckon with futurist as well as 'realized' elements in the Fourth Evangelist's eschatology; witness the four-fold reference to 'the last day' in ch. vi. and the three-fold promise 'I am coming' in ch. xiv. There is, he shows, a future as well as a present judgment in John's scheme. (Query: Is Dr. Howard right in applying the phrase 'realized eschatology' to Otto's interpretation of the Synoptic eschatology? Does not that phrase properly apply to Dr. Dodd's view? Would not such a word as *proleptic* better befit Otto's 'infiltration' theory?)

Striking features of the book are: (1) Dr. Howard's theological use of grammar. *Vide* his comment on Jn 3^{16}: 'He (John) might have written ὥστε δοῦναι ("as to give") to mark the measure of the potential gift. Instead, he writes ὥστε ἔδωκεν ("that he gave") to declare the magnitude of the recorded act.'

(2) His statistical strength: see *e.g.* the discussion of 'faith' on p. 155.

(3) His repeated insistence that Christianity according to St. John is not an isolated phenomenon but can only be properly understood against the background of common apostolic Christianity.

Three other passages in the book deserve particular mention: the discussion of *Memra* (p. 48) (this word was never employed 'to express the dynamic word of Creation or the medium of revelation'); the summary of recent views on Jn 1^{29}; and the remarkable modern parallel from Wesley on p. 201 ff., which proves that mysticism and apocalyptic can, given the proper conditions, spring from the same soul.

We have two criticisms—a major and a minor. First, it would have conduced to clearness if each chapter had been split up into sections with appropriate headings. Second, Dr. Howard assumes the truth of Windisch's theory about the five Paraclete sayings. Having thus got rid of them as later additions he can proceed to the solutions of the eschatological problem. But it is a big assumption.

We commend this book to every student of the Johannine literature. It is not a popular book—in places we found it difficult—but it is replete with wide learning, careful scholarship and sound judgment.

A. M. Hunter.

JOHN BUNYAN

Bunyan Calling: A Voice from the Seventeenth Century, by Miss M. P. Willcocks (Allen and Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). This is a fascinating book—graphic, full of insight, learned and original, so far as a book on Bunyan can be original. It is 'a voice from the seventeenth century' in the sense that the story is told on the background of that interesting, terrible and critical age. Miss Willcocks has steeped her mind in the memorials of the time, and the social and religious conditions keep breaking in with remarkably illuminating effects. You live with the proletariat and rebel with them against the oppression and injustice of the upper class. You read with Miss Willcocks the books Bunyan read and wallow in the social mire that lay thick over all the land. Sometimes a voice from the twentieth century breaks in to remove the illusion as when the author analyses with the dubious theories of the 'new psychology' the religious experience of Bunyan. But for the most part we live and breathe in the seventeenth century.

The portrait of Bunyan in the frontispiece is a striking one. It might almost be that of a cavalier and quite explains the contemporary description of him: 'He was tall of stature, somewhat of a ruddy face, with sparkling eyes, wearing his hair on his upper lip, after the old British fashion; his hair reddish; but, in his latter days, time had sprinkled it with grey; his nose well set, but not declining or bending, and his mouth moderately large; his forehead something high, and his habit

always plain and modest.' It is the description of a strong man, and the 'sparkling eyes' vouch for the sense of humour which comes out so often in his works. It is amazing that he managed in his restricted life to write twenty-five books, besides innumerable sermons. This may be partly accounted for by the fact that his imprisonment was really (like St. Paul's at Caesarea) a kind of free custody which allowed him to go out and in and even to attend the Church meeting.

Some of the most sympathetic and revealing pages in this book tell us of Bunyan's domestic life. He was twice married and happy in both experiences. Elizabeth, his second wife, is the heroine of his dramatic story. Miss Willcocks devotes a whole chapter to her, and the tale of her courage and devotion is very moving. She was a second Jeanie Deans. Over and over she appeared before the Justices to plead for her husband's liberty. In spite of rebuffs and insults she persevered, at one moment almost prevailing, when she found herself in the presence of a good man like Sir Matthew Hale. We know little else of the two women who were so loyal to Bunyan, but the story of Elizabeth, as revived by the brilliant pen of this new biographer, will not soon fade from the hearts of those who read it.

The religious history of Bunyan has often been written. It was written by himself in one of the supreme religious classics of our language. But the history of the man himself and of the people to whom he belonged, and of the historical and social conditions that partly explain him, has not often, if ever, been narrated as it is in this book which will take a high place among the lives of the famous and the great. One grave defect is the want of an index.

F. J. Rae.

CHRISTIANITY IN SEARCH OF A PHILOSOPHY

Dr. Leonard Hodgson, Regius Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology in the University of Oxford, has made a timely contribution to the theological debate in his most recent work, *Towards a Christian Philosophy* (Nisbet; 10s. 6d. net). He explains that the remaining stocks of most of his books have been 'blitzed' (what a word!), and that in this work he has revised and corrected those parts of two of them ('Essays in Christian Philosophy' and 'The Grace of God in Faith and Philosophy') which he is still 'conceited enough' to think of as pointing the way for philosophers and theologians alike.

Perhaps the present book has suffered in form from its composite origin. At any rate it is somewhat loosely knit together, contains a good deal of reiteration, and might have shown a better arrangement of the matter. Now and again, also, the lecture form seems to have 'survived.'

But, as already said, it is a timely work. It says some things, *e.g.*, about the new supernaturalism in theology, as represented by Emil Brunner, that are worth pondering; as also about the new idealism in theology, as represented by Dr. William Temple. And the whole work reflects a vigorous and lively, not to say genial, outlook upon present-day issues in philosophy, science, and theology. Particular indebtedness is acknowledged to H. W. B. Joseph and C. C. J. Webb.

The title of the book is also its third and last sub-title, though the discussions on Faith and Philosophy in Part I. and on Freedom, Grace, and Providence in Part II. are also contributions 'towards a Christian Philosophy.' But only 'towards.' Much as the author affirms in these pages of interest and value, he only adumbrates what he conceives to be the lines of a true Christian Philosophy, that is, of a Christian Philosophy for our new age. Of this he is well aware.

He takes his stand upon the 'great tradition,' the '*philosophia perennis*.' He cannot think of Christian Philosophy as making use of any other philosophical form. It must seek for a reality which shall satisfy the criteria of self-consistency and self-justification. Or, more explicitly, it must endeavour through its concept of reality to relate the actual world of scientific investigation to the ideal world of self-consistent, self-authenticating goodness. That is what St. Thomas Aquinas did for his time. And now in our time a new theological synthesis is called for, in which the Christian gospel and the 'great tradition' shall once more be associated in a unitary structure. But even the foundations of that structure are hard as yet to discern.

Professor Hodgson, as already indicated, is not satisfied with the new supernaturalism. With a shrewd thrust he charges Emil Brunner with not being purely evangelical, seeing that the most fundamental elements in his thought are certain timeless general truths of reason. These he does not derive from the Biblical revelation, but applies to it, with an effect upon Christology and on the value of the Gospels for mankind which, in Professor Hodgson's opinion, is disastrous. 'The divine Christ, who is the object of faith, is no longer revealed in and through "Christ after the flesh," so that in Him man may see manifested the character of God and the pattern of human life; the Incarnation becomes the "divine incognito," and the sole and only value of the Gospels is their certification of forgiveness to faith.'

Nor is Professor Hodgson satisfied with the recent presentations of absolute idealism. He deprecates a revival of pre-Nicene Logos-theology in the effort to solve the philosophical problem of creation, as though the doctrine of the Trinity contained within it the solution. It is in the pre-Nicene Logos-theology that Dr. William Temple finds the metaphysical formula necessary to relate the eternal transcendent being of God to His temporal immanence in creation. But this appears to Professor Hodgson to minimize the truth of the independence of the created universe; and it would seem to him that Dr. William Temple and those who think with him have in this instance subordinated the witness of the Christian revelation to the demands of absolute idealism.

Here is how Professor Hodgson defends his own

attitude of present non-committal to any definite philosophical position: 'Philosophy demands full acknowledgment of the actual as well as the search for logical self-consistency and self-authenticating goodness, and if there are elements in the actual which are indigestible by any known philosophical scheme, then to assert this fact and to remain for the time being in a state of philosophical dissatisfaction is a truly philosophical position.' Which is all very well, if dissatisfaction does not relax through time into indifference.

W. FULTON.

The Huguenots: Fighters for God and Human Freedom, by Mr. Otto Zoff (Allen and Unwin; 16s. net), tells the story of one of the most prolonged, heroic, and tragic struggles for religious and human freedom. As given here the story relates almost exclusively to the political side of the struggle. We could have spared pages of court intrigue and royal sensuality to have been told more about the personal faith and life of the rank and file of the Huguenots. The author also practically finishes his history with the fall of Rochelle and the end of the Huguenots as a military and political power. He deals very briefly with the long-drawn tragedy which followed the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, when the best blood of France was shed in inhuman butcheries or drained away to foreign lands. The part which the Huguenot refugees played in the early colonizing of America makes an interesting chapter. The writer is gifted with a clear and vivid style and his narrative is at times deeply heart-moving. It makes easily understandable why John Knox feared the introduction of the Mass more than ten thousand armed enemies, and why the English people, with full knowledge of the frightful doings across the Channel, acquired a deep-seated dread of Popery.

An altogether admirable book, and one much needed, is *The Army Chaplain*, by the Rev. P. Middleton Brumwell, C.B.E., M.C., K.H.C., Deputy Chaplain-General (A. and C. Black; 3s. net). It contains much information about the Royal Army Chaplain's Department, about the duties of Chaplains, their training, their opportunities, their problems and difficulties. On the 'Parade Service' it says the final word about compulsion. It gives the welcome information that there is now a school which every Chaplain attends for a three weeks' course, to fit him for his work. It gives the surprising news that, in order to help men to turn their minds to Christian service, and especially the Christian ministry, courses in theology, Hebrew, Greek, and other subjects are provided. But above all, and well worth the price of the book, is the last section on 'Morale.' If any minister wishes a subject for an address to youth he will get one here, full of suggestion and illustration. This book is a real gift and all Chaplains should have it in their kit.

The Glasgow University Oriental Society (founded by the late Professor James Robertson, D.D.) is to be congratulated not only on the publication under present conditions of Volume X. (Years 1940 and 1941) of its *Transactions* but on the maintenance of its learned and scholarly tradition. This volume has been edited by the President of the Society, Professor C. J. Mullo Weir, B.D., D.Phil., of the Chair of Hebrew and Semitic Languages. It has been well and carefully printed by Civic Press, Ltd., Glasgow.

The eight articles contained in the volume reproduce, in part at least, eight papers read before the Society. Professor Norman W. Porteous, in the article 'Shalem-Shalom,' writes on the god Shalem and the Shalom-motif. The Rev. R. B. Douglas writes on 'The Christian Puran' of Father Thomas Stephens, a poetical work first written in Portuguese and then translated into Marathi, designed to give an outline of the facts on which the Christian religion is founded and of its essential doctrines. Professor John Mauchline, in the article 'Ishtar-'Ashtart,' considers the problem of the etymology of the word Ishtar and the use of the name Ishtar and its correlates. Dr. Henry G. Farmer gives an account and rendering of an early Arabic treatise on Calligraphy; the treatise is included in the section on prosody in the Rasa'il of the Ikhwan al-Safa (tenth century).

The fifth article, 'Der Macarius,' is a description by Miss Agnes Gibson of a visit paid by her some years ago to the monastery of Macarius or Makar in the Wadi Natrun in Northern Egypt, one of the oldest Christian monasteries. The Rev. Richard Bell writes on 'The Sacrifice of Ishmael,' considering the Muslim belief that it was Ishmael and not Isaac whom Abraham was prepared to sacrifice, and who willingly submitted. The Rev. David M. G. Stalker discusses 'Some Present-Day Problems in Ezekiel-Criticism' in view of the recent theory that there may never have been a prophet Ezekiel such as accepted tradition represents him. Professor O. S. Rankin in 'Ha-Levi's Kuzari as Jewish Apologetic' shows how a Jewish writer of twelfth-century Spain presented Judaism as a religion of revelation in contrast to Christianity and Islam, which were 'religions of reason.'

The Rev. Maldwyn Edwards, M.A., Ph.D., has made the subject of Methodism his own. He has now published the third volume of 'a trilogy of books dealing with the social and political aspects of Methodism.' Its title is *Methodism and England* (Epworth Press; 12s. 6d. net), and it is described as 'a study of Methodism in its social and political aspects during the period 1850–1932.' It is an excellent piece of historical writing, carefully compiled and clear in style. It shows the gradual development of the Methodist interest in social, economic, and political questions from the diehard conservatism of Jabez Bunting to the fervent radicalism of Hugh Price Hughes. It is on the whole a very honourable record and forms a highly important and interesting chapter of English history in the nineteenth century.

A book which discusses the social implications

of the gospel will help many inquirers and teachers. This is the object of *Christ and the Age*, by Mr. H. W. Goldsack (Epworth Press; 4s. net). He does not aim at elaborate treatment but at introducing the reader (and it is mainly the youthful reader that is in view) to the problems on which light can be thrown by the teaching and spirit of Jesus. The book is admirably fitted for group discussion, but it will be of real assistance to preachers as the headings of the chapters will indicate—Gambling, Drink, Sunday, Politics, Nazism, Communism, War, Peace, the Kingdom of God. It ought to be said that there is a good deal of information on all the above subjects that will be useful to ministers, club leaders, and others. The treatment of the subjects is intelligent and suggestive. With regard to Gambling, for example, while it is almost impossible to construct a watertight argument against it, Mr. Goldsack comes as near that feat as anyone could.

There is no need to apologize for the appearance of so fine a book as *The Groundwork of Prayer*, by the Rev. Reginald Lumb, Rector of Chislehurst (Faith Press; 5s. 6d. net). The author thinks there is a lack of 'middle' books, that is to say, books between theological treatises and very popular and 'slight' affairs. In this he is probably wrong. There are many middle books on this subject, and such books continue to come out in large numbers. But all the same this particular book is more than welcome. It represents the substance of a year's preaching and tries to show the Biblical background of the great words of prayer, and to meet some of the problems of human thought and spiritual experience which earnest people have to face. The book has three divisions: The Approach to Prayer, The Substance of Prayer, and The Perfect Prayer. All the problems of prayer are dealt with here in an intelligent and candid manner. The explanations of the Lord's Prayer, so simple and sufficient, are especially welcome.

A new series called 'The Forward Books' is being issued by the Independent Press at 2s. each. They are all 'Congregationalist' books in the sense that all the authors belong to that persuasion and write out of their own rich tradition. They are trying to say what they conceive to be the contribution of their Church to the joint stock of truth and grace. The first four booklets are *The Living God*, by the Rev. John Marsh, M.A.; *Congregationalism and the Church Catholic*, by Principal Nathaniel Micklem, LL.D., D.D.; *The Open Bible*, by the Rev. R. K. Orchard, B.A., B.D.; and *The Ministry*, by the Rev. John Huxtable, M.A. The books are all good. As might be expected, the most interesting of the four is that by the Principal of Mansfield College. Dr. Micklem has given us an essay with all his characteristic qualities, candour, modesty, fearless and independent thinking. He is a severe critic of some sides of Congregationalism. But the wounds are the wounds of a friend, and Dr. Micklem is loyal to his own people.

An admirable book on Judaism, on all its sides, is *Judaism and World Order*, by Mr. Hugh J. Schonfield (Secker and Warburg; 4s. 6d. net). Two million Jewish men, women, and children have already been brutally exterminated. Millions more have been tortured and starved. It is doubtful whether more than two-thirds of the Jewish people will survive this war. This not only makes a claim on our sympathy and help, but it also challenges us to understand what Judaism stands for. And this is what Mr. Schonfield sets out to provide. His hope is that Judaism and Christianity together may constitute that Holy Nation to which the future may belong. But meantime he would have the ordinary Christian enlarge his knowledge of the Jewish spirit and philosophy. Mr. Schonfield is wholly sympathetic. The Jew is a universalist, he says. He has little to learn from any other faith, for to him God is the Father. His *Torah* is an elastic thing, capable of infinite expansion and of application to all ages. It governs all relationships on the basis of the unity and Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man. The wholly eulogistic and optimistic attitude of this book will probably hinder its welcome by more critical minds. But it is a good thing to have so earnest and able a presentation of Judaism, even though here and there we are impelled to put a query opposite the text.

Professor E. Allison Peers of the University of Liverpool is a well-known authority on Spanish mysticism. Among his works is an edition in English of the writings of St. John of the Cross. Now, under the title, *Spirit of Flame* (S.C.M.; 6s. net), he has given us a popular and most readable study of that great Spanish mystic, who was a fellow-worker, four hundred years ago and more with St. Teresa, in the Reform Movement within the Carmelite Order. Present-day Carmelites speak of him as *el Santo*, and of her as *la Santa*.

Professor Peers not only tells the story of John's career and offers a sympathetic picture of him as a follower of the Mystic Way but also gives us an account of his poems and commentaries. Nearly the whole of John's literary work consists of extensive commentaries on his three greatest poems—the 'Spiritual Canticle' of the Toledo prison, and the two 'Songs of the Soul' known respectively, from their first lines, as 'Dark Night' and 'Living Flame of Love.' Apropos of the last-named, Professor Peers remarks that 'it is probably true to say that no other author, either before him or since, has written of mystical Union with the unalloyed beauty which we find in this poem and its interpretation.'

Just as he used vivid symbols in description of the intimacy of union with God, so also those who knew him had recourse to vivid symbols in description of his own goodness and purity. In particular, they thought of him as a 'flaming torch.' And a modern Spanish poet has caught up the symbol and used it in comparing the two founders of the Reform,

> Teresa, soul of fire!
> John of the Cross, spirit of ardent flame!

Where Lies the Hope of the World?

By Professor John Foster, M.A., Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham.

If the question had been asked at the close of the last century or during the first decade of this, it would have occasioned either mild surprise or a quick answer. The nineteenth century has been called the Century of Hope.

In the year 1859 Charles Darwin published his *Origin of Species*. It was the fullest setting forth of a theory for which men had long been feeling. No longer in bits and pieces, here was a complete statement concerning the emergence and advance of human life. It implied a philosophy of life. It provided an idea which was to become paramount not only in biology, the sphere where Darwin began, or in physical science only, but in almost every branch of study—politics, sociology, philosophy, history, religion. That idea was Evolution.

It is an epoch-making work. But we must not exaggerate. Darwin's theory alone would not have been enough to write *progress* in capital letters across the nineteenth century. The philosophy of progress carried the day because the decades before, and those immediately to follow, saw discoveries and inventions crowding in to change men's ways of life. Who could doubt the idea of progress when everything around one was obviously on the up-grade? It reminds me of the short-sighted lady from the country who, in the department store, got on to the wrong escalator. As she gave up the unequal struggle she was heard to murmur: 'I did want to go to the bargain basement, but every time I stopped to get my breath, here I was, back among the baby linen!'

Between the close of the Napoleonic War, 1815, and the beginning of the First World War, 1914, what a spectacle of progress! At the end of those one hundred years, life has changed by the measure of centuries. Here are some of the inventions: Steamships, railways, telegraph, sewing-machine, camera, electric light, telephone, motor cars, the cinema, wireless telegraphy, aircraft. Living at a time like this, who could doubt that such was the story of the past, and that such would be the direction of the future? Throughout the millennia there had been the long ascent of man, struggling onward and upward; from animal to savage, through tribe to nation, the pageant of succeeding empires, the emergence of international organization; rising standards and heightened powers, the upward surge of all mankind.

Christians are in the world, if not of the world. The Christian thought of a period may be expected to reflect something of that period's prevailing mood. Nineteenth-century Christians caught the optimism of their times. The Student Volunteer Missionary Union was launched, with its watchword, 'The evangelization of the world in this generation!' Anything might happen in this generation. The world was on the up-grade. The Kingdom of God was at the end of the staircase up which the ascent was swift and sure. Some spoke as if it lay just round the corner.

We were reminded last October that it was fifty years from the death of Alfred Lord Tennyson. He is a good example of this Christian optimism:

> I the heir of all the ages, in the foremost files of time. . . .
>
> Not in vain the distance beacons. Forward, forward let us range,
> Let the great world spin for ever down the ringing grooves of change.
>
> Thro' the shadow of the globe we sweep into the younger day:
> Better fifty years of Europe than a cycle of Cathay.

Fifty years—what had happened of progress in those fifty years to which he could look back! Fifty years more and who knows what might happen? *It is fifty years more, and you and I know what has happened.*

I listened to a strange broadcast of Dr Julian Huxley's some little time ago. He summed up the contribution made by his great predecessor as a biologist, Charles Darwin, by saying that, because of his work we no longer believe in the Fall of Man. We believe rather in the Ascent of Man. A strange statement to be made by one who is supposed to deal scientifically with demonstrable facts—strange to be made in this year of the world's ruin, 1943! There are some survivals from the blithe optimists who duped us last time—a world fit for heroes, safe for democracy, only get the war won and the world resumes the inevitable up-grade! But it is harder to put over that sort of stuff now. This is a disillusioned generation. We know that much of man's progress throughout this scientific age has been progress towards man's own destruction.

Matching this mood of disillusion there has come a reaction in Christian teaching. For my part I dislike labels, but most of our younger theologians seem to wear one. It is inscribed Neo-orthodox. Whether you like the label or not, you may agree with me that it is good to hear

men preach again as though they believed in the sinfulness of sin—not the too-easy optimism of the Ascent of Man, but his Fall.

Some, in the zeal of this rediscovered emphasis, go on to what I can only call a theology of despair. To think, they say, of the Kingdom of God as something to be established among the nations of this world, the leavening of society with Christian ideals, the reform of industry according to Christian principles, the building up of world peace—this has been to misunderstand the gospel. There is no permanent value in the created world. It is not here that you may find God's purposes triumphant. This world-order is under the condemnation of God. The Christian is saved out of it, to await his Lord's coming on the clouds of heaven—Judgment, the End, and the Kingdom of God which is from above, wholly other-worldly. What shall we say to this ?

In times of reaction we must try to keep our judgment sane. As a student of history I give you my verdict : From these few thousand years of human history that we do know, one must acknowledge that there is something in it which goes onward and upward ; not mechanically—it is conditioned by human effort ; not without a break—there are periods of decline as well as of advance. But through the whole story that is the prevailing direction of the change, onward and upward. If you ask what it is, I say man's *growing capacity to do*. That may sound incomplete : to do what ? Ah, that is just the point.

I can best illustrate from something which has never been far from my mind during this last year. The island of Hong Kong was ceded to Britain in 1842. It fell to Japan just as 1942 was dawning. If you walked about the green hills of its lovely southern shore you would find at a place called Stanley a pathetic little graveyard. It was there that the British first tried to settle. The gravestones will tell you the result. They bear the names of wives and children of our soldiers, whole families gone in a week, the men too sometimes. They must have died like flies. And no one knew what it was. We know. It was malaria.

For the next chapter of the story you have to leave the China coast and go to India ; in time it means a jump of fifty years, to 1892 (the year of Lord Tennyson's death, as I have mentioned). It was then that Major Ronald Ross began those experiments which were to pin down responsibility for the spread of this disease on the mosquito. Had it been in an earlier age, his discovery might have affected part of India. But coming when it did . . . why, it meant that where in 1842 the wives and children of British soldiers died, my wife and children were to be able to find a healthy summer resort. You can sleep in Hong Kong without mosquito-nets now. The change affects not only Asia. When I went as a missionary to China, one of my friends was sent to the White Man's Grave. He looked none too robust. Some of us doubted the wisdom of his going. He came home after twenty years there. And he makes me look pale and thin. West Africa may not be a health resort, but it is not a Grave any longer. The disease which has depopulated great tracts of the world's surface, which has accounted for the downfall of civilizations—for where it does not bring death it means vitality doomed to periodic ebb—malaria is conquered. Given the sort of co-operation and the radical treatment of problems which we achieve in time of war, the world could be swept clean of it in a single generation. Man's mounting capacity to do !

I began with Stanley in the Island of Hong Kong, 1842. In 1942 perhaps you heard of Stanley. This is the place where the British population of Hong Kong is herded together behind the wire. According to the way they have been underfed, it will be surprising if in Stanley there is not another pathetic graveyard. That reminds us of how it all began. In 1931 a small group of men belonging to the Japanese High Command plotted thus : 'We will use the nations' distaste for modern war as our opportunity to achieve dominion over our neighbour.' Had it been in an earlier age, the blow they struck would have affected Manchuria. But coming when it did . . . Manchuria 1931 was discussed in a beer cellar in Munich, and in 1933 Hitler came to power with an identical programme for aggression in Europe. Two years more and an Italian brigand had launched a similar adventure in Abyssinia. 1931 Asia, 1933 Europe, 1935 Africa ; in 1937 the aggression is passed back to where it started, Japan begins the second stage of her imperialist expansion by invading China Proper. Two years more, 1939, and the Second World War has begun. The world is aflame. Soon half the habitations of mankind are in ruins. Man's mounting capacity to do !

This which goes onward and upward, and which in our day has mounted to such terrifying proportions, can turn to either good or evil. We have already experience of both. *The* question is, which is to prevail ?

In the subject called the Comparative Study of Religions, one of the things most worthy of comparison is the view of History. Hinduism regards it as belonging to the sphere of *maya*, illusion. That is one of the reasons why we find it difficult to come to terms with Mr. Gandhi. To him and his kind reality belongs to an inner world of thought and feeling to which events of the time sequence bear no relation. He can shut himself

in with his nice feelings and disregard inconveniences (like the Japanese hammering at the door) which you and I have to face as real facts of a real situation. The Buddhist is similar: Events in this world order have no lasting meaning. Salvation is from the wheel of change to that non-existence which is *Nirvana*. The Muslim, true to the meaning of his name, 'one who submits,' regards events of history as predetermined by the iron will of Allah. What of the Christian?

Ours is a religion peculiarly dependent upon History. Take from it one historic fact, and Christianity is gone—all of it. We believe that in the sphere of history something happened. It is not only that God created all things, and crowned His creation with Man, even man who should struggle onward and upward through the millennia, till at last he came to this almighty question-mark—which way? That is but the first part of the story, Creation. The second part is Redemption. Surely it is to mark them as standing in this relation that Genesis and the Gospel are set forth in language so similar:

In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth.	In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God.
And the earth was waste and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep: and the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters.	All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that hath been made.
And God said, Let there be light: and there was light.	In him was life; and the life was the light of men.
And God saw the light that it was good; and God divided the light from the darkness.	And the light shineth in the darkness; and the darkness apprehended it not.

We do not with the Humanist believe in the Ascent of Man. We know there is an ever-recurring tendency for man's choice to be wrong. We believe in the Fall of Man. But we do not believe that God left us merely with that parting of the ways and that knowledge of our weakness. God interfered. He meant—and *means*—that interference to be decisive. We believe in the Descent of God:

> 'Who for us men, and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. . . .'

Do the words of the Creed seem distant from the tragic events of 1943? To feel so is to mistake their meaning. They refer not to an incident which is, as it were, a point in the time series, a point now left nineteen hundred years behind. They refer to an event which opens a new era, in which Christ is central, and through which He shall become all in all. The Incarnation once begun, goes on, is now, and ever shall be:

> 'Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations . . . and lo, I am with you alway.'

We have that Presence. Or as St. Paul puts it:

> 'The Church which is His body, the fulfilment of Him who is being out-and-out fulfilled.'

In His Church is the continuance of His Incarnation. It goes on growing, to represent Him more and more effectively on earth, to continue the saving work which He began, to increase the number of His disciples in all the nations, to achieve throughout the world those purposes for which His world was created.

It is not that man is on the up-grade, nor yet that Christianity as a vague disembodied influence is leavening society and improving human life. It is that there is within human life and all its tragedy one set of men among whom His Kingdom has come, His will is being done, and through whom His purposes shall be achieved. Present in God's world, and never so widely established as in this our day, is God's Church. Its worship, work, and witness compass the globe. It is the centre of history. It is the hope of the world.

And what is it, this world-wide Church, but sinners like you and me, with the Lord in the midst?

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

'On the Shelf'

By the Reverend Stuart Robertson, M.A., Lisbon.

We all know what 'on the shelf' means: it means forgotten, neglected, out of sight, and out of mind. When some problem is shelved, it is put out of the way for good. When somebody is shelved, he has been got rid of.

Why? A shelf is a very necessary thing and a very useful thing. As I write I am surrounded by shelves, full of books. They are all 'on the shelf,' but they are not forgotten. I know where each is. They are all remembered friends, ready to come off the shelf and talk with me at any time.

There are shelves in the kitchen, but cook doesn't

forget the things that are 'on the shelf' in the kitchen: she has put them there in their places so that she can lay her hand on them when she wants to.

There are shelves in the greenhouse; but the gardener didn't put his pot-plants on the shelves to get them out of his sight. He knows exactly where each is. Why, then, should 'on the shelf' mean forgotten?

I think 'shelf' means a high top shelf, in a bookcase or a cupboard. There, things are shoved away and forgotten, and only rediscovered when spring-cleaning comes along, when it is often a surprise to come upon them, and you say, 'I wondered where that had got to!' It hadn't 'got' to anywhere; it had been *put* on that top shelf and forgotten. So when you are having bookshelves fitted, don't have them higher than your own height, and then, even on the top shelf, nothing will be out of sight and nothing will be out of mind.

What have you got on your top shelf? Have a look and see. Perhaps you will be surprised. Perhaps you will find something you will be glad to find. I know what some people will find if they look: a Bible! There it lies, dusty, forgotten, unread. No! I am not just imagining things. Every home has, I fancy, a Bible, but in far too many homes it is 'on the shelf.' I read lately in the Report of the British and Foreign Bible Society how an old woman in Hungary was very interested by a colporteur reading to her from the Bible. 'Won't you buy one?' he asked. 'Oh,' was the answer, 'I've got one somewhere in the house, but I'm not sure where.' A search discovered it, put away, covered with dust, on a top shelf with other forgotten things. She brought it down, dusted it, most grateful to her visitor for having made her rediscover her Bible, and promised that it would never go back 'on the shelf.'

I was rung up one day on the telephone by a lady who wanted to know if I could tell her where in the Bible there was 'something about feeding ravens.' I said, 'You mean about ravens feeding Elijah.' 'Yes, that's it; where is it?' I told her where it was, and added, 'Have you got a Bible?' 'Of course, I have,' she answered, almost indignantly, as if to say, 'What a question to ask!' But my next question bowled her out: 'Do you know where it is?' 'Y-y-y-es! I think it's somewhere on the shelf.' When she went on to ask me where to find 'something about Solomon in all his glory and the lilies of the field,' I felt that her Bible was very much 'on the shelf.' So our conversation ended by my saying, 'Now, get it off the shelf and *don't put it back*.'

Another time I was rung up by a man who wanted to know the rest of the verse which begins, 'The mills of God grind slowly . . .' I told him the rest, and then he asked where it came from. I told him. Then I said, 'But why?' 'Oh, there were some eight of us talking together, and one quoted it, and the question arose as to where it came from. Seven thought it was from the Bible; but I didn't think it was.' So there, you may say, were seven and a half Bibles 'on the shelf.'

I have an evening service on Sundays at Estoril. It is held in a room in a hotel, and I have to take my Bible with me. One day, before I had got used to things here, and having been accustomed of course to find a Bible wherever I went for service, I found I had forgotten to take one with me. I thought, 'I'll easily borrow one from an English visitor.' I went to five hotels but no English visitor had a Bible! They themselves were in Portugal but their Bibles were at home in England 'on the shelf.' I got one at last at the Bridge Club! Their Bibles were so much 'on the shelf' that they didn't think even of packing them but left them at home when they went on holiday, as some people leave their cats! Just think! The Bible has been translated into almost every living language; agents of Bible Societies are circulating it in every land; many to whom it is a new book are gladly buying it and reading it; but English folk are not reading their own English Bible.

Just think, too, how much the Bible has counted for in our history; through what sacrifice, and heroism, and brave adventure, and tragedy of suffering it has come to us. And then think how sad it is that such a thing should, in any English home, be 'on the shelf.'

I hope you are collecting books that will be your good friends, always at your call, always at hand, and never forsaken and forgotten on some high top shelf, out of sight and out of mind.

Be sure that among them, and the chief of them, is the English Bible; for it is a friend you simply can't afford to shelve, and it tells you of the best of friends—the Lord Jesus. Books will come your way that you will read once and never care to read again. You can afford to put them 'on the shelf' and leave them there. They amuse, they 'pass the time,' but the Bible will teach you to 'redeem the time.' Keep it at hand and read it, not as a duty, but as a delight.

Cinderella-Beryl.

By the Reverend Derrick Cuthbert, B.A., B.D., Laxey, Isle of Man.

'Out of weakness were made strong.'—He 11^{34}.

One of the nicest things about the story of Cinderella is that it is continually coming true. All kinds of Cinderellas, once unnoticed and unvalued, are receiving recognition. This is especially true in the realm of science; the modern scientific discoverer is rather like a fairy-godmother, for he often transforms things held to be of little account into objects of beauty and use. Take, for example, the story of the changing of beryl into beryllium.

'There's nothing unnoticed or unvalued about a beryl,' you say? You are right, of course, if you mean those valuable, precious-stone beryls after whom some of the very best girls are named. They have been highly regarded for many years, especially those rich deep-green ones called emeralds and those others, bluish-green in colour, which bear the Latin name for sea-water, aquamarine. But the Cinderella-beryls I am thinking about are the poor relations of these lovely gems; the good-for-nothing beryls for which there was no use at all

until quite recently. Now the scientist fairy-godmother has come along and in his laboratory he has obtained from these beryls a very light, silver-coloured metal called beryllium, and an astonishing metal it is. Mr Anthony Pirie has been telling us about it on the radio.

First of all, it is almost transparent to X-rays, and it is now used for the 'windows' in the wonderful X-ray equipment of our hospitals. The most amazing thing about it, however, is what it does to other metals when it is made into alloys with them. Mixed with nickel it gives a compound four times as strong as steel. A beryllium-nickel spring, for example, will bend *fifteen thousand million* times before it breaks! One fiftieth part of beryllium mixed with ordinary soft, pliable copper will give you metal tools so hard that they can cut through steel, and never make a single spark while doing so. How valuable such tools must be in mines or other places where one spark might mean an explosion or a disastrous fire! Beryllium and its compounds are doing all kinds of jobs in this war, from guiding aeroplanes to refining petrol, and after the war there may well be no end to their usefulness. Beryllium may even transform seaweed into artificial silk!

I began by saying that the Cinderella story was always coming true. Do you know that it can come true in your life in a way even more wonderful and more important than in the case of the poor despised beryls? There is Someone who can take hold of your life and mine, unimportant and unnoticed folk though we be, and bring out the possibilities of goodness and usefulness in such a way that the whole world will be blessed. He can turn our softness into strength of character and purpose, our dowdiness into beauty. By linking our lives to His own, Jesus can make us the kind of folk the world needs more than it needs anything else, people who are truly good and great. This is no fairy-story. It happened to St. Peter and St. Paul. It has been happening all through history to thousands upon thousands who, as the text says, 'out of weakness were made strong.' Let it happen to us! It will, if we really give ourselves to our Saviour, to be His in thought, and word, and deed.

The Christian Year.

WHITSUNDAY.

The Voice from the Open Spaces.

'The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the Spirit.'—Jn 3^{8}.

Nicodemus had come to Jesus by night for a private interview, and now the Master and His visitor were probably talking together in some house in Jerusalem. Jesus was speaking about the necessity of a new birth, and a new life, but the astonished inquirer asked how there could be such a thorough renewal, such a fresh beginning.

It was the work of the Holy Spirit, said our Lord, and everyone must be born again of the Spirit. That Spirit of God affected the lives of men as a regenerating power, which made them new creations and changed them into the children of God, with their Divine kinship strongly marked in a new viewpoint, a new motive, a new character. They would then see the Kingdom of God and enter it too; they would have experience of God's reign, not merely as subjects, but as sons. The Holy Spirit would produce this transformation in their outlook and action, the Holy Spirit would refashion human lives, but how? In what way did this radical alteration in people happen? What was the Holy Spirit like and how did the Holy Spirit work?

Jesus replied that the Holy Spirit was like the wind, blowing at that moment through the narrow streets of Jerusalem. Could not Nicodemus hear the wind? Or did he hear only the other sounds in the street that night?

It was the desert-wind, blowing from the great open spaces, and it was an immeasurable and uncontrollable element, which went where it liked, and no man could say it nay, or check its progress, or command it to be still. Such is the Holy Spirit, a Divine sound heard above human sounds, a mysterious force audible above the cries of the street, touching people, stirring them with new thoughts and impulses, and making them listen to something higher.

1. 'The wind bloweth where it listeth,' *and where does it not list to blow*? There is no part of the world where the air is always perfectly still and where there is never any breeze. So there is no place unvisited by the far-travelling Spirit of God.

This was a surprise to Nicodemus, who thought of God's self-communication as institutional, embodied in temple and synagogue, closed in by rubric and code, ceremonial and law. It seemed shut up in static forms. His contemporaries must have felt the atmosphere of sacred things rather stuffy, and the air of religious observance must have become so stale and used up, that people could not breathe freely but longed to escape. It was unexpected and welcome news that God's self-revelation was free as the open air.

> Long ago I was friends with the wind:
> I am friends with it yet.

Can we say that, when the wind is 'the spirit of wisdom, and of love, and of a sound mind'?

2. 'The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell *whence* it cometh.' To a certain extent, of course, we can tell the quarter from which the wind is blowing, and say that it comes from north or south, east or west. But there is a mystery about the origin of the wind, since we do not know where exactly it arose, what distance it has come, over what terrain it has passed, and what faces in town and country it has touched on the way. There is a mystery as to where the Divine breeze, the voice and pressure of God's spirit upon us, came from, and from what circumstances, scenes, and impressions we were aware of God speaking to us.

The Holy Spirit may blow upon us as a regenerating coolness. Sometimes during a hot day in

Geneva, a cold breeze rises quickly, because it is blowing down from the snow and glaciers of the mountains. So the Holy Spirit may strike a man with an icy breath, amid the sultry air of sensuality, or the sweltering blaze of hatred, or the sunshine of selfishness, when he was warm with some anticipated enjoyment, gain, or power, till suddenly he felt chilled, went dead cold to the dazzling glare, and turned away with a shiver at what he had nearly done. Or the regenerating coolness may blow upon people when they are in a fever of dread, 'heated hot with burning fears,' enervated by alarm which bolts from responsibility and will neither pray nor serve, till suddenly the scared mood is braced into a quiet courage. How did the change happen to us? The Holy Spirit blew through the stifling apprehension with refreshing coldness, the voice from the open spaces spoke to us, 'Fear not,' 'Be of good cheer,' 'Let not your heart be troubled,' and made us cool and collected. A new life came to us; we were born again, with a new vision of God's sovereign love and kingly care; we saw the Kingdom of God and entered it too.

Again, the wind of the Spirit may kindle a fire. Nicodemus asked, 'How can a man be born again when he is old,' when he has settled down in fixed habits of thought or action? Perhaps he is sitting alone with his broken purposes and lost ideals, 'like a late guest over a fading fire, when all the goodlier guests are passed away,' shut in with his regrets, when the voice from the open spaces calls him, the wind from heaven makes him listen, and the dwindling embers of the soul are fanned into a blaze of response.

Out of what set of circumstances did the wind of the Spirit come to kindle the dying embers of manhood into a bright, steady glow at which many will warm their hands? To a certain degree, we can trace our spiritual renewal back to some influence, and tell when and where were the turning-points for our soul. Some know the exact time and place of their spiritual renewal. Its origin was some sudden death, some recovery from illness or escape from danger, some sermon or book or friend. That was when the Divine breeze touched them and disturbed them with its voice calling, calling till they answered and were brought to Christ, and were changed. But that is not the whole story. There was something farther back than their impression and their decision, and it is God's continued search of them, God's spirit moving swiftly hither and thither, travelling how far no one knows, like the wind of the desert.

3. 'Thou canst not tell *whither* it goeth.' We hear the voice of the wind on the gable or among the trees, but where will that wind be an hour later? We do not know the destination of the wind, and we have no inkling as to what scenes of opportunity and inspiration the wind of the Holy Spirit will carry us and what sort of future is in store for us. If we listen to the sound that is above human sounds, where shall we arrive? The uncertainty as to this may make some people nervous and hesitant about responding to the voice from the open spaces, that calls and calls. They may exclaim, 'Oh God where do you intend to take us?' We wish to see the Kingdom of God, because international relations are so perplexing, and we realize that the Kingdom of God is the ultimate, beyond any political ideology, or Utopia, or Family of Nations. But to what constructive policy will the Holy Spirit lead us?

Yet who knows
Where the wind goes?

Kate knows a thing or two useful at home,
Darns like a fairy, and churns like a gnome;
Jack is a wise man at shaping a stick,
Once he's in the saddle the pony may kick,
But hark to the wind how it blows!
None comes, none goes,
None reaps or mows,
No friends turn foes,
No hedge bears sloes,
And no cock crows.
But the wind knows.

'The wind knows,' God's Spirit knows the developments, the conflicts, the golden dawns ahead, the better future He has in mind for us. There is a mystery there also, but it is not a mystery that should hold us back. It is the secret of Divine love which has planned something higher for us, and if we respond to the voice of the Divine wind we shall be born again and discover that the mystery of birth is followed by the no less mystery of growth in which character comes to blossom and fruitage. Thus we can go far in purposeful and victorious living, if we yield to the impulsion of the Holy Spirit.[1]

TRINITY SUNDAY.

The Strong Name.

BY THE REVEREND IAN GRAY, B.D., FAIRLIE.

'For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.'—1 Jn 5^7.

Trinity Sunday never seems to find the same response in the hearts of worshipping Christians as do the other notable days of the Christian Year. The doctrine of the Trinity is good enough to take up the time of a theologian in his study, we say, but it is useless to men and women contending with the practical business of living and trying to live after the pattern of our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Yet the true Christian is a Trinitarian, however scornfully he may regard the doctrinal expression of that truth. Do we not sing lustily in our hymn, 'God in three Persons, Blessed Trinity,' and other expressions with a like meaning? Are not our children baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost? Has not the Apostolic Benediction most often used the same insistence upon these Three? Do not our public prayers, the prayers to which we all give the assent of our 'Amen,' often end with the words 'Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, One God'? Surely it is not right to partake in

[1] A. A. Cowan, *Captain of the Storm*, 73.

all these things ignorantly, without any consideration of the meaning behind what we sing or do or say? If we do so, then we are putting ourselves on a level with the heathen who repeat mumbo-jumbo formulas because they believe that, though there is no sense in them, there may yet be some magical efficacy. It is true nevertheless that an ability to grasp some little of the meaning of the Trinity is no substitute for saving faith or sacrificial living. But our active Christianity is not weakened by some knowledge of the Trinity, rather it is deepened and strengthened. Did not St. Paul say, 'I will pray with the spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also. I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also'? Trinity Sunday then is a day when we might well stop and consider the meaning of what we have been praying and singing about the Trinity, and bring to bear upon it our understanding. Then we will not dismiss it as a mere term of scholars, but rather try to see what it means, what it can do, and for what it stands to-day.

1. *The Trinity is not an invention, pure and simple, of theologians.* It is the result of the response of ordinary men and women to what they can behold and know of God. The natural world, to thinking men, has always suggested a Maker. It seems to be the plan of some mind, and the work of some hand. The whole working of Nature, the variety of seasons, the distinction of species, the alternation of day and night, the preciseness of all that lives both small and great, the laws that science finds underlying phenomena, all speak, in Wordsworth's phrase, of 'something far more deeply interfused.' Behind is a someone, and that someone we call God. In the beginning men saw Gods and not one God—a God of the Hill, a God of the Tree, a God of the Stream—but ripe experience such as is found in the religious geniuses of Israel concludes 'The Lord Thy God is one God,' or, as the Apostles' Creed puts it, 'God, the Father Almighty, Maker of Heaven and Earth.' Then in the fullness of time Jesus came within the veil of human flesh, and thinking, trusting men saw a life that bore the unmistakable stamp of all that they meant by God. They felt the same awe before Him as they felt in the deep silence or before the vast grandeur of Nature. Isaiah, who saw God in a vision 'high and lifted up', has his experience almost exactly duplicated by Peter when he meets Jesus for the first time. Men felt that God and Jesus were somehow one and the same. Jesus acknowledged that it was so. 'I and my Father are one,' He said. Yet men felt the Father and the Son separate, though they still believed that the Lord is one God. Then, in the time of Pentecost, the Spirit was shed abroad. Men of faith were then conscious not only of God, the world Maker and Ruler, not only of Jesus the Wonderful, who had been in the world, but of this other Comforter within them whose presence they felt like to that of God or of Jesus. It was from this kind of faith, the belief of men and women like ourselves, that there came the formula of the Trinity. God and Jesus and the Holy Spirit were not individuals, distinct and never meeting. They were three different persons, but they made upon men the same impression, and the impression was God. The jeers of men that we worship three Gods should not shake us. We are here in a sphere where arithmetic is of no avail. The mystery of the Godhead is not solved by figures. The Lord our God is one God, and when we are on our knees we know it. We know also the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit, each with a personality of His own. But before one God, which is yet these Three, we bow. 'Through Jesus Christ we have . . . access in one Spirit unto the Father.'

The doctrine then is only an attempt to give a name to what ordinary men and women felt about Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, as yet One God; that so it could be set down in the Creeds of the Church. But its explanation is not only simple.

2. *Its existence is of great comfort for our salvation.* Surely it is of infinite value to know that this is what the Godhead was like from eternity, that always there were Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, One God. God was the Father of the Son before He became our Father, long before Jesus told the secret of His Fatherhood to men. The Son was not created to meet human need. He did not become God at Bethlehem. He became man. He existed before there were humans to need Him. He played His part even in creation. 'Without him,' says John, 'was not any thing made that was made.' Nor did the Spirit come first or only at Pentecost. Genesis is not wrong to see Him also at Creation, nor the Old Testament untimely with its mention of the Spirit's working in the men of Israel. These Three always were, and the statement 'God is love' shows how they were related to one another. From the beginning the Father loved the Son, the Son the Spirit, the Spirit the Father! God did not change to save men. This love only reached down from Them all in one Person, to embrace men and gather them also within this loving circle. What greater comfort then is to be found than here? The beginning of all beginnings, the first and last that can be known, is God in three Persons, each free to choose and all choosing to be a unity in love.

3. *There is an immediate value in lifting, however briefly, this veil that hides the Trinity.* This is the age of New Orders based on very old, yet seemingly ever new, ideologies. These, whether they be racial or merely material, refuse to recognize man as a person. Their aim is order, and they claim that to realize this end man must not be looked upon as a spiritual being, free to think and choose and act for himself. He must be subjugated until he becomes a docile animal in the herd, or an efficient cog in the production machine, either way a something to be exploited by a master mind. The actual wars that now ravage the world have their beginning in the conflict of those ideas with the idea of man and harmony implicit in the Trinity. The Trinity reveals God in three Persons, each choosing to love the other and so forming one indivisible unity. This Tri-une God created man in His own image, and man too can be embraced in this order of love, if he so chooses. 'As the Father hath

loved me,' said Jesus, 'so have I loved you: continue ye in my love.' So any New Order where man is not left free to choose God is the denial of the reality at the heart of things, and must sternly be resisted. 'This,' said Jesus, 'is my commandment, That ye love one another, as I have loved you.' So any order, national or international, which denies this may endure for a season but it is not eternal. For it is the reversal of the will of Him by whom all things were made. The conflict to-day is narrowed down to a struggle between oppression and freedom. But the whole cry for freedom would be meaningless if behind it there lay not this aim that men should be free to be persons, able to choose and to choose the best, to love God and Jesus through the Spirit, and to love their neighbours as themselves. A true fight for freedom cannot have for its aim the disorder that freedom unbridled often brings in its train, but only the fulfilment of Jesus' prayer that men might be one though they are many, as Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one in love though three. It is the life of the Trinity, this 'union in partition,' that lovers of true freedom desire to be seen among men.

So the age-old doctrine of the Trinity has its beginnings in simple faith, strengthens the Evangel, and even casts its helpful light upon the problems of to-day. The scholars of old and the lovers of freedom everywhere join hands. In God the One in Three alone is there salvation, peace and promise for men. For only after that loving pattern does a man keep his own soul, and yet is one with all his fellows and with his God.

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Ideal of Love.

Some Christian Perspectives.

BY THE REVEREND DR. JOHN SHORT, M.A., BOURNEMOUTH.

'Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit.'—1 Co $2^{9.10}$.

Here is one of the *loveliest* passages of Paul's writings. Great things have been experienced, and greater things are still to come. Yet, if we read these words with imagination we shall detect a note of rebuke. Paul is writing to a people who have lost the first fine glow of Christian faith and service. Then the gates of a new life opened before their wondering eyes. But division, strife, rivalry, and even worse, crept in to disrupt the life of that little Christian community.

What was true then is true still. We make a mistake if we treat these words as though they implied an inevitable and progressive unfolding of the providence and grace and love of God, for that progressive revelation depends on us as well as on Him. The Old Testament is the record of the revelation of God, of His providence, His nature, and His purpose. The Prophets were inspired men and women who sought to set before their fellows things that had been revealed of God. But their hearers either would not, or could not, take it in, and so the picture is presented to us in the Old Testament pages of great, inspired souls wrestling with a perverse and gainsaying people. The New Testament tells us of the climax of that revelation in Jesus Christ. Yet we have recorded for us in the sayings of Jesus some of the saddest words that ever fell from the lips of man: 'Ye will not come unto me, that ye might have life.' How hard it is to be willing to give so much and to find that men and women are prepared to receive so little. The same story is continued throughout Apostolic times. Across the seas and along the great highroads of the Empire liberated spirits sought to proclaim the gladdening news of the gospel of God, but how soon the fires of persecution began to burn, and how long became the tale of Christians martyred for the sake of their faith. Sometimes that same reflection is true of the Church itself. Dr. Jowett, in one of his great sermons, once said something to this effect: 'Challenging words were once uttered to a Church. "Thou thinkest thou art rich and knowest not that thou art poor." But,' he went on to say, 'if the Spirit were addressing some of our Churches to-day, He might reverse His language, "Thou thinkest thou art poor and knowest not that immense riches of grace and love and power are at thy disposal if thou wouldest only receive them."' And that truth, surely, holds for our own times and our own individual lives. Again and again the vision of a high call, or a new adventure has flickered before the almost dazzled eyes of the community, and we have trembled on the threshold of a great forward movement. New inventions have created a situation full of wonderful possibilities for the whole human race. A League of Nations built on the ruin and tragedy, the bloodshed and sacrifice, of the last war enshrined the hope that war would at last be banished from our world. The vision has perished because of the selfishness or the sinfulness or the ignorance and foolishness of men. God wants to give so much, but we are not willing to receive. Again, men and women will debate the problem of the reality of God, or of His providence, or of His purpose; they will discuss at inordinate length whether or not petitionary prayer should be offered to the great Creator of the Universe. And we don't realize that God becomes real only to those who give Him His chance. 'Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him.'

Now, there are three great affirmations in the Christian gospel that lead on to an ever-enlarging spiritual experience. And the first is, *the Love of God*. Christ and His Cross is the Revelation of a great reality, namely, God is Love. At the heart of the mystery in which we are set is an Eternal Spirit of Holy Love. If men and women would but make that thought their daily affirmation of faith until it gripped mind and heart and imagination it would mean an enlargement and an enrichment of life that nothing else can bring. God's world works by way of love; no other way is satisfactory. Everything that is best in life is

related to love. Without it there could be no great art. No writer has achieved great literature unless he has been in love with his matter and his method. The scientist is a disinterested lover of truth. There can be no real home or parenthood, or friendship, unless at the heart of these things there is a spirit of love. All that is best is related to love. Love has transforming power! God is Love! That great affirmation of faith inevitably opens up new possibilities, new perspectives, and our values are seen in a new light. Love alone sees clearly and deeply and purely. Without love you can never know God, for God is Love. Without love you cannot know your fellow-men, for there is something in the hearts of men and women created by the spirit of love that responds only to love. In fact, without love we can never really know anything. 'Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard . . . the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his spirit.'

Again, *the gospel sets our lives into perspectives of eternity.* It brings the soul of man into a large place. Man has forever. Time is put into its true setting, and men and women are delivered from the tyranny of to-day and to-morrow. God has planted eternity in our hearts! Among the enemies of modern life are noise and speed and clamour and urgency. Against these God offers to the soul of man a certain leisure of faith. 'He that believeth shall not make haste.' In fact, life for any one of us is somewhat like a landscape painting. Much depends on the background. An Exhibition of Water Colours has been held in our neighbourhood and visitors have been delighted by the beauty, the intensity and the vividness of the scenes that have been depicted for us by great artists. And yet, as one looks at these lovely paintings, one reflects that no scene could be quite so intense, or so vivid. The explanation is that such pictures are abruptly limited by the canvas and by the frame. The truth is that Nature is still more intense, still more vivid. Only in the natural reference we do not see it so, because it stretches out into infinite distance. So is it with our lives. The colours will always be too bright, or too dark, unless we constantly remind ourselves that man has forever. The Christian is meant to live in perspectives of eternity. That is part of the gift of life God offers him. Hold to it, it will help you to handle the problems of the hour. It will enable you to sit down to plan out your days in a spirit of leisure. It will enable you to adjust yourself not merely to to-day, or to to-morrow, or even to three-score years and ten. Life is meant to be adjusted to a scale of eternity. Life here is the overture, not the opera. It is only the preface, the book is still to be written. In God's gift of love man has forever.

And in the last place, *the gospel invites us into new dimensions of fellowship and service with God.* That is why one of life's essentials is to make a place for worship, for praise, for prayer, for meditation. We need to recover the spirit of worship, for men and women are so constituted that they become like the object of their worship. Perhaps we begin to realize that necessity once more. A letter appeared in *The Times* only the other week, under the heading 'Intellect and Belief.' From that letter I take these excerpts. 'The regulative idea of the Kingdom of God, and the notion of man as co-operator with God in the promotion of perfection into this disordered world of sin, has been largely forgotten. The teachings of the fathers and the mediæval Church are ignored. Sentimentalism (feeling without reason) has been allowed to overrun the polity of the Churches . . . in other words, we suffer, tragically, from intellectual coma, and this at a time when the popular interest in secular subjects was never so great. . . . The implications of the Incarnation should be forcibly pursued to their last term; until all this is done we shall continue to grope in the wistful half-light of frustrated ideal.' Yes, God has much to offer, and in Jesus Christ we have an opportunity of estimating, if we will, the magnitude of His gift. Vista upon vista longs, within His progressive purpose, to unfold itself to our receptive spirits. The wonder is that God, who is so anxious to give so much, does not become impatient with us, does not cast us out.

Once again we stand on the threshold of a new opportunity. Not many nations have been given a second chance within the span of a single lifetime. We lost our first great chance to achieve great things twenty-five years ago, and the opportunity has again come. Can we take it? Listen once again to the words of one of the world's great seers: 'Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him. But God hath revealed them unto us by his Spirit.'

SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Snare of Worldliness.

BY THE REVEREND A. D. HARCUS, M.A., EALING, LONDON.

'But Jesus answereth again, and saith unto them, Children, how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God!'—Mk 10^{24}.

Riches can be a misleading word. As the well-known passage in the Gospel is read and we picture the young man coming running to Jesus and hear him make his request and get his answer and then go away sorrowful for he had great possessions, the story never fails to interest because it gives especially in St. Mark a close-up view of Jesus. But the big lesson of the incident is apt to pass us by; it applies to those who have riches. The first thought of riches is concerned with money, bank balances, possessions in some negotiable form. It is difficult to get out of that way of thinking and yet if riches be regarded as signifying real wealth and meaning the possession of this world in some form or other then the story does apply and with great force to-day. Riches

is a comparative term, one man's wealth is another's poverty and the comparison has special application when it is used for different ages and stages in history. Thus viewed the average man of to-day is a millionaire when compared with the rich man of Bible days. The point need not be elaborated, simply stated with one or two examples given. The gift of extra time for work and leisure through the perfecting of artificial light, the room thus illuminated complete with books, pictures, piano, wireless, soon television. The world itself brought near through quick transport, not to mention such side issues as organized games, the cinema, and all the host of things that crowd in to make modern life the colourful, stirring experience it is and tends to be more and more. Whatever then our Lord had to say about riches applies directly to us all. Let the word, however, be changed. Even when explained it still is apt to mislead. Instead let it be worldliness, which may be defined as being occupied with the things of this world. How hardly shall they who are occupied with the things of this world enter into the Kingdom of God.

Now why, where is the danger? The world itself is not evil. 'God saw every thing that he had made, and, behold, it was very good.' How good man is only beginning to understand, and so imagination can dwell upon the future and see visions of ever-increasing wealth. The post-war world may be impoverished in some ways but it will abound in real wealth. War quickens the pace of invention and already the scientists are picturing the shape of things to come. Yet clearly something is lacking and has been for some time. Can it be that the very fullness of life has been its peril, the wealth has hidden the poverty? Take concrete examples from our own day. Consider a typical good-living younger man or woman of the years just before the war. Home, a garden and a car, work with an element of strain in it and therefore leisure all the more enjoyed. What a temptation to use Sunday! The pressure of things increases, worship recedes, the Bible is not read because there are so many other books that simply must be looked at. And in any case if there was a need for religion the wireless could be switched on provided the sermon was sufficiently interesting, if not there will be an alternative programme ready. Supposing no trouble arises, serious illness or any misfortune, what chance has religion over a personality of that kind? He is the rich young ruler come to life again only with even greater possessions. It all seems good, it certainly is not evil, and yet there is something lacking. The snare of worldliness of this kind is that its very wealth hides its real poverty. And Jesus can say 'Blessed are ye poor: for yours is the kingdom of God.' It ought not to be so, logically a possession of the world should lead directly to a faith in the God who made the world and gave it to man. Actually just the opposite is true in experience. The more we possess the world the further away God seems to be. Possessions are a barrier between us and God, they hide God from us. 'Children, how hard is it for them that trust in riches to enter into the kingdom of God!'

Sooner or later the snare of worldliness reveals itself and the sense of poverty, of insufficiency, drives us to ask, 'What lack I yet, what extra things do I need to face and tackle the problems of living?' And the reply is in the terms of the gospel, not more things, more possessions, but a complete reconstruction of life. 'Go, sell that thou hast, and come, follow me, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven.' In another form the same drastic advice is given, 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and all these things shall be added.' The advice is a reaffirmation of the old central commandment given to Israel, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and soul, and strength.' Every means were to be taken to impress that advice on the nation especially on the younger generation in the formative years. These words were to be taught, made the subject of conversation out of doors and indoors, to be visible everywhere on the gateposts and on one's apparel. As if to say, such is the snare of worldliness, the world is so near, so attractive, the danger is it will hide God from His people. The peril of the world is not that it is evil but that it is so very good. And yet, 'Thou hast made us for Thyself and our hearts are restless till they find their rest in Thee.' It is all so obvious but we all more or less fall into the snare of seeking the world first and then God second. Indeed such is the wealth of life around us to-day that it is almost impossible to avoid the snare. How hardly, it is a grim saying, but it is true and the truth of it no generation knows better than our own. Possessions, inventions, scientific discoveries do not of themselves lead to the Kingdom of God, indeed the cynic might say, as he looks around him to-day, they lead right away from it. The escape from the snare is to put first things first, to restore the worship of God and make Him central in our lives. It is obvious platitudinous advice, and yet if 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God' became the flaming passion of our hearts and minds, became the central creative principle of the life of our beloved land, became the unifying power in and through the whole world to-morrow, we would not have to seek very far for the other things of life, they would come to us in ever increasing abundance. But this new treasure would be 'in heaven', where moth and rust do not corrupt nor thieves break through and steal. There would be no snare in this kind of wealth because all life was centred securely in the thought of God. No word is more urgently needed to-day and will be in the developments after the war. Real wealth will inevitably increase as we increasingly enter into possession of this world. Our Lord's word still holds good, 'How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God.'. The dilemma is resolved in that great saying, 'Seek ye first the Kingdom of God, and these things shall be added.'

Hebrew Metre and Old Testament Exegesis.

By Professor T. H. Robinson, D.D., University College, Cardiff.

The study of Hebrew metrics is the most modern development in the field of Old Testament research, and there are still many who regard it as unnecessary or even injurious. This is partly due to the extravagance of certain scholars, who have applied their principles to the text with such rigidity as to demand an inordinate number of conjectural emendations, and partly to the fact that the bearing of metrical study on exegesis has not been fully appreciated. It may be worth while to call attention to some features of the case which are apt to be overlooked.

Metre, in general, is based on a succession of units which shall present a more or less regular sequence or at least a symmetry, thus satisfying in the later portions of a line, sentence, or passage, the expectation raised by the earlier. It is in this respect that the 'metre' of poetry differs from any merely prose rhythm; it satisfies the expectation far more completely, though there may often be an element of dissatisfaction which will prevent a sense of monotony.

Now in classical and modern metres the unit is always one of sound (except, possibly, in some forms of *vers libre*); the effect may be produced by a combination of long or short syllables, of accented and unaccented syllables, by identity of sound at the beginning of words, or by similarity of sound at the ends of lines. But in the oldest types of poetry, *e.g.* in Chinese, Accadian, and early Egyptian, the unit is one of sense rather than of sound. It is the symmetry of ideas which gives the poet his form, and it is a thought-expectation which is satisfied. It is to this type that the poetry of the Hebrew Bible belongs. A great deal of patient scholarly research has been devoted to the phonetic aspect of Hebrew poetic form, and terms like 'stress' and 'beat' are still commonly used to describe the units. But these studies, when carefully considered, throw light on the phonetics of the language as a whole, rather than, specifically, on its poetry as contrasted with its prose. It is true that Hebrew poetry cannot be correctly read without producing a powerful effect on the ear, as well as directly on the mind, but this is due to the nature of the language, in which the whole force of a word seems to have been concentrated on the accented syllable at or towards the end. Accurate reading of Hebrew prose is equally impressive, though it lacks the comparative regularity which necessarily distinguishes poetry. If the Hebrew bard had been asked whether he counted his thoughts or his syllables, there is no doubt that he would have answered 'the thoughts,' though we may well doubt whether he ever asked himself (or was asked by others) a question of that kind. It is possible that it was the close relation between sound and sense in Hebrew which led to the development of a phonetic rhythm, *e.g.* in Syriac and Arabic.

The principle just stated has long been recognized, and was first formulated by Lowth in the middle of the seventeenth century. His term 'parallelism' has been, and still is, almost universally employed, though its basic implications have been frequently overlooked. Simply stated, his theory means that every line of Hebrew poetry has at least two parts, of which the second more or less completely fulfils the expectation created in the mind of the hearer by the first. The effect may be enhanced by the addition of a third 'member.' Here, obviously, the fundamental consideration is that of the thought and not of the sound. The work of Ley, who may be regarded as the founder of the modern school, distracted attention from the true state of the case by laying too much emphasis on the *sound* of Hebrew poetry, but it did good service by its analysis of the verse-member, and by its establishment of a numerical system of measurement which is just as properly applicable to a 'logical' as to a 'phonetic' type of verse. The true successor of Lowth was Buchanan Gray, whose restatement of parallelism showed the path along which he might well have led us further but for his sudden death at the height of his powers. Unfortunately, Gray's work, which appeared first as a series of articles in the *Expositor*, was published in book form near the beginning of the last war, and failed to achieve the reputation which it deserves.

Attention may be called to two aspects of Hebrew poetry which seem to follow from the principles of Lowth and Gray. The first is that the unit of thought and the unit of form will coincide. In other words, a 'metrical' division of any kind necessarily involves a sense division. If two or three words are metrically grouped together, and sundered from what precedes and from what follows by a break in the verse-form, then they will be taken in thought more closely with one another than with what comes before or with what comes afterwards. There are apparent exceptions, but, as Gray showed, these do but

give us further light on the poet's mind and purpose, when they are considered in relation to the whole of which they form a part. There can be none of that syncopation to which students of metre give the name *enjambement*.

The second point is that at times two or more words may be taken together as forming a single idea. This is in full harmony with that tendency to regard the whole rather than the parts which Pedersen and others have noted as an essential feature of Hebrew psychology. Two words in the construct relation may well be regarded as a single idea, especially if one of the two is a short word. (Here, it may be remarked in passing, there are signs of the operation of sound as well as of thought, though it is natural that a long word should have more meaning in it than a short one.) Many little words, such as prepositions, pronouns, and negatives, will normally count as part of the same idea as the heavier word which they precede. Most students of Hebrew metrics give lists of words which seldom or never form independent units, and these often repay careful consideration, for, if they do assume an independent place in the poet's thought, it is clear that he must have laid very strong emphasis on them.

The question of 'mixed' or 'uniform' metres has aroused much discussion, and scholars are still far from general agreement. But the weight of the evidence seems to be on the side of uniformity, allowing for certain regular variations—just as in the classical hexameter we have the use both of the dactyl and of the spondee. All Hebrew metres are based on combinations of two or of three units, and commonly fall into two classes, with a rather rare third. Metres are described by figures indicating the number of units in each verse-member. In the first class we have 3 : 2, varied with 2 : 2 and sometimes with 2 : 3. In the second we have 3 : 3, varied with 2 : 2 : 2, and sometimes with 3 : 3 : 3. A few poems have a 4 : 3, which may usually be further analysed into 2 : 2 : 3, though the first break is slighter than the second as a rule. A good example of the first type is to be found in Ps 23, where *v.*[4] contains three 2 : 2 lines and the rest is 3 : 2. Pure 3 : 2 or 2 : 2 is comparatively rare. 3 : 3 is, generally speaking, the most frequent of the metres; it is that of Job and of many Psalms—Ps 103 is a good example. The mixture of 2 : 2 : 2 is frequent in prophetic poetry, but seldom occurs elsewhere, while a practically pure 3 : 3 : 3 may be seen in Ps 24[7-10] and in Ps 100. Even the maintenance of these regular metres requires a certain amount of conjectural emendation, but it appears to be justified both by the variations which we find in parallel passages in the Hebrew itself and by the differences between the two forms of tradition current in Palestine and in Egypt, the former represented by the Massoretic text and the latter by the LXX. Some apparent irregularity may be explained by the presence of anacrusis—a unit standing at the beginning of a line as a kind of introduction which is not counted in the enumeration proper. Occasionally, too, a word may be so loaded with meaning as to have the value of two units, though this never occurs in two-unit verse-members; a single word never has the value of a full member.

A recognition of these facts will affect our exegesis in two ways. It may first control our grouping of the words. Sometimes this is not of profound importance, though it has an æsthetic value. How often do we hear Ps 103[6] read:

> The Lord executeth righteousness and judgment
> for all that are oppressed.

But the metre of this poem is 3 : 3, therefore:

> The Lord executeth righteousness,
> and judgment for all that are oppressed.

Here we have a 'stairlike' parallelism, in which the mind of the hearer is led gradually upwards till it reaches its climax. More important is such a case as that which occurs at the beginning of Ps 46. The poem (apart from the refrain in *vv.*[7] and [11]) is an almost pure 2 : 2. We must look at the Hebrew to get the arrangement:

אלהים לנו מחסה ועז
עזרה בצרות נמצא מאד

Now we can correctly translate this 'God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble.' But does this give us the emotional content of the Hebrew? Take the first two words. In a sense they stand alone; at least there is a slight break in the thought before we come to the second verse-member. If we had these two words alone, what would they mean to us? Surely something like '*We* have a God' or, better (since אלהים probably is a substitute for יהוה), 'God is *ours*'—a great claim in which the note of confidence and triumph rings swiftly out. The tense, staccato cry of exultation follows, further defining this supreme possession: 'a refuge and strength'—thoughts which the skilled preacher can elaborate—and goes on with a fresh specification: 'a help in trouble.' Then the second line ends with the further definition (note the *Niph'al tolerativum*): 'easy to find—very easy.'

Anacrusis, again, may have a significant bearing on the kind of feeling which a passage evokes. It halts the hearer's thought, makes him stand and wait in expectation, and thus enhances the force of what follows. Sometimes it calls attention to a contrast, and may be very effective at

the beginning of a poem. Thus the 'How' of La 1^1 2^1 4^1 is not a question; it is even more than an exclamation, it is a wail, and at once by its very independence of what follows creates the atmosphere for the whole of the piece. In the Psalter words like 'Behold' often make us pause and really look for what is coming. The divine name, too, sometimes stands alone in this fashion, and prepares us with a brief interval of expectation for the next utterance. A single pronoun may be very impressive, *e.g.* in Ps 41^{10}; the poet has been describing what he has suffered at the hands of his enemies, and then turns to his only hope:

> But thou—
> O Lord, be merciful unto me. . . .

Again the metre enables us to catch something of an emotional content which no mere translation can reproduce.

The other direction in which metrical studies may help our appreciation of a poet's meaning lies in the emphasis which may be placed on words which are usually or often not significant enough to carry the whole weight of a verse unit. Here pronouns and negatives are especially prominent. We may take an example from Is 1^{2-3}. This little poem is in 3 : 3, with an opening 2 : 2 : 2. The verses run:

שמעו שמים	והאזיני ארץ	כי יהוה דבר
בנים גדלתי ורוממתי	והם פשעו בי	
ידע שור קנהו	וחמור אבוס בעליו	
ישראל לא ידע	עמי לא התבונן	

At once we are caught by the variation in the opening line. It is as if the prophet meant us to understand that he was merely preparing the way for his real message, and that this would be of unusual weight. In the second line the obvious fact is that in the latter half two pronouns—one of them with a preposition, it is true—assume the full value of verse-units. That is to say that each of them is an independent and significant element in the statement, and, as we have already observed, when a normally insignificant word demands our attention, its stress must be very great. The inconceivable thing has happened. 'Think of it! Here are my children—not strangers, slaves, or animals, but children' (note the emphatic position of the word). 'See what I have done for them. I have tended, protected and fed them till they have grown to their full stature. Even then my benefits did not cease, for I kept on' (note the change of tense) 'raising them higher and higher. Yet they—yes, they, *they*, THEY have rebelled against me—not against some foreign or tyrannous master, but against me, *me*, ME.' However emphatically we may print it, cold type inevitably fails to do justice to the intensity of feeling which the metrical arrangement reveals.

The third line is a comparatively calm statement of general fact. But in the fourth, again, we meet with insignificant words raised to a high level by the metrical value accorded to them. This time they are negatives, and a Hebrew negative is usually little more than a prefix. Standing as they do in this line, they become in a sense the most important words in the verse; it is on them that the whole force of the comparison depends:

> The ox knoweth his owner
> And the ass his master's stall;
> Israel doth NOT know,
> My people doth NOT consider.

Once more we feel the inadequacy of any mechanical representation when we try to bring out the intensity of emotion which the words imply.

These few illustrations have been selected, almost at random. But they are typical of ways in which we may use what we already know of the forms of Hebrew poetry, and of their bearing on the language as an expression of the inner meaning of Scripture. There is much that can not be represented in writing, much that possibly even eludes exact verbal explanation, but a preacher who has allowed himself to be steeped in the language of the Bible will find that his experience of things found there which cannot be uttered will unfailingly manifest itself in his handling of the text, will give life and wealth to his exposition, and will so bring to his hearers, however dimly, a sense of the wonder and the glory of the messages contained in the Word. And the metrical form supplies a factor which cannot safely be overlooked.

Contributions and Comments.

The Passion Sayings.

The Rev. T. E. Bleiben's criticism of my study of the Passion Sayings in *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, in the March issue of The Expository Times, calls, I think, for some reply, both as regards the method and the substance of his argument. In the work mentioned I examined in great detail some thirty sayings. Mr. Bleiben simplifies his task by considering four of them. These he takes in pairs, selecting a single point in connexion with one member of a particular pair and setting it over against a related point in the other. He claims that I draw the same conclusion from opposite premises, ignoring the fact that a particular conclusion in my survey may be, and often is, based on several distinct considerations. For example, in respect of the Cry from the Cross (Mk 15^{34}) he selects my comment on its unexpectedness, and represents me as arguing: 'It was, therefore, actually uttered by Jesus.' Over against this he sets my observation that Lk 23^{46} is harmonious with the whole spirit and life of Jesus, although on the same page I refer to the reserve necessary in treating Lukan Crucifixion sayings. 'Thus,' he observes, 'the same conclusion is drawn from opposite premises.' The other example is even more striking. Taking no account of the five pages in which I discuss the Markan Prophecies of the Passion (8^{31}, etc.), Mr. Bleiben selects my suggestion that Jesus might have been expected to speak of His victory over death, and he compares this with my adoption of F. C. Burkitt's submission that an early Christian would have been strongly tempted to introduce a reference to the Resurrection into the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen. 'Thus,' he says, 'in the one case the mention, and in the other the omission to mention, the Resurrection is held to support the genuineness of sayings attributed to our Lord by St. Mark.' Surely we may ask: 'Why not, if the sayings are of a different character?' A prophecy of the Passion is a very different matter from a veiled allusion to death in a Parable. In my opinion a reference to the Resurrection in the former is as natural as it would be strange in the latter.

I should not have thought it necessary to make this rejoinder but for the rest of Mr. Bleiben's article. He thinks that we must abandon the attempt to discover what Jesus taught. He appears to share the pessimism of R. H. Lightfoot, that the Gospels yield us little more than a whisper of Christ's voice; that we trace in them but the outskirts of His ways (*History and Interpretation in the Gospels*, p. 225). For my own part, and for reasons which I have given elsewhere, I cannot consent to this capitulation to Continental Form Criticism. I judge that I have fairly indicated Mr. Bleiben's point of view because he bids us embrace a humbler aim and a less ambitious method, that, namely, of disentangling the motives and interests that influenced the formation of the Gospel tradition and the writing of the Gospels themselves. This, of course, is a legitimate field for inquiry. But it is a delicate task; and I do not think that Mr. Bleiben furthers it by his attempt to distinguish what Mark believed from the implications of the material in his Gospel. Let us grant that Albertz was not without justification in thinking that in the pre-Markan complex, 2^{1}–3^{6}, some one sought to show the historical circumstances that led to the death of Jesus. Can we, however, legitimately argue that this aim is opposed to Mark's view, the essence of which, according to Mr. Bleiben, is that the necessity of Christ's death is grounded in the will of God as expressed in Scripture? I cannot see any doctrinal interest in 2^{1}–3^{6}; and so far from the view mentioned above being at all peculiar to Mark, it is shared by all the Evangelists and is a commonplace of primitive Christianity. I pass by Mr. Bleiben's attempt to show that ii. 19b, 20 is in contrast to Mark's view, as well as his discovery that the teaching of the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen concerning the punishment of the criminals is 'an equally striking contrast to St. Mark's usual attitude.' I find these distinctions too subtle. I turn rather to the claim that Mark's teaching is Pauline. Mr. Bleiben finds M. Werner's *Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium* an obstacle to this thesis, and he falls back on the view of the late B. W. Bacon that what we find in Mark is a 'more commonplace workaday type of Paulinism.' I doubt, however, if this Mareth line can withstand assault, for we have now come to see, with Johannes Weiss and others, that much which we label 'Paulinism' is simply primitive Christian belief.

Mr. Bleiben's main submission, I take it, is in his closing paragraph, and especially in the passage:

> 'There is no one interpretation of the death of Christ in the New Testament, or even in the Synoptic Gospels. Difference in doctrine is no especially modern phenomenon. Critical study of the New Testament finds it present in even startling measure in the Primitive Church.'

That there are differences of emphasis in different parts of the New Testament, and in different Gospels, we should all agree; but these observations, I think, are very dangerous half truths; for, despite the variations, there are deep-seated agreements, as I have sought to show in *The Atonement in New Testament Teaching*. Mr. Bleiben expresses no opinions on the agreements; he leaves us face to face with nothing but startling differences. He recognizes that to some of his readers his conclusions may be unwelcome and disturbing, but he does not appear to see why. The conclusions are unwelcome and disturbing, not because of the differences, but because these

are not balanced by any recognition of the fundamental agreements. Most remarkable of all is his assumption that such a position as he outlines furnishes a ground for Reunion. We are entitled to ask: 'On what doctrinal basis shall we unite?' Surely something more is needed than a bundle of negations and an agreement to differ on the vital doctrines of Christianity. Particular theories will doubtless be preferred by different individuals, but there is no basis for union unless, with Tertullian,[1] we believe that the death of Christ is 'the whole weight and fruit' of Christianity.

VINCENT TAYLOR.

Headingley, Leeds.

Acts ii. 1–13.

IN this passage, so carefully scrutinized, has anyone suspected a rather lengthy gloss?

It is appropriate to start from Kirsopp Lake's discussion in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. v. 111–121. Calling attention to the doublet in verses 7 and 12 (ἐξίσταντο δὲ καὶ ἐθαύμαζον λέγοντες and ἐξίσταντο δὲ πάντες καὶ διηποροῦντο), he offers his theory of two divergent sources, with Luke as editor and harmonist. Admitting the doublet, I should like to suggest tentatively an alternative explanation.

The doublet is not characteristic of Luke's literary style. But if one of the duplicates must be jettisoned as non-Lucan, it seems preferable to drop verse 7, and to keep verse 12, which is about as Lucan as could be. ἐξίσταντο δὲ καὶ ἐθαύμαζον is perilously near to bathos. How did it come into existence?

On the theory of a gloss, verses 7 to 11 ought to be relegated to the margin. Luke's original would then have run, from verse 4: 'And they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance. Now there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, from every nation under heaven. And when this sound was heard, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man heard them speaking in [? his] own language. And they were all amazed, and were perplexed, saying one to another, What meaneth this? But others mocking said, They are filled with new wine.' The scholiast presumably wished to comment on ἐξίσταντο δέ in verse 12. So he wrote ἐξίσταντο δὲ ἐθαύμαζον λέγοντες, οὐχὶ ἰδοὺ πάντες οὗτοί εἰσιν οἱ λαλοῦντες Γαλιλαῖοι; and so on to the end of verse 11. Some copyist, when subsequently incorporating the scholium in the text, wrote ἐξίσταντο δὲ καὶ ἐθαύμαζον.

This surmise, if it is accepted, saddles the scholiast with several matters for which otherwise Luke has to bear either a direct or an indirect responsibility. The curious Greek of οὐχὶ ἰδού is one detail; and the placing of Judaea between Mesopotamia and Cappadocia is another. But chiefly, of course, it relieves Luke of any specific mention of foreign languages in his description of the Pentecostal experience. Even if the neutral text is adopted in verse 6, is it impossible to translate it 'every man heard them speaking in their own language'? τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ is all that the Greek says. The question is whether the possessive adjective, required in English, ought to be borrowed from εἷς ἕκαστος which precedes, or from αὐτῶν which follows. But no such doubtful exegesis is involved, if the Western text is substituted. D, the Syriac versions, and Augustine read simply 'speaking with tongues.'

The main objection to such a gloss, I suppose, is its great length. Jn 7^{53}–8^{11}, if it could be regarded as a fair parallel, would be reassuring! Jn 5^{4} (about which there is no dispute) is much shorter. No doubt such questions cannot be properly decided except on strictly technical grounds. Yet I must confess a personal reluctance to believe either that the descent of the Holy Spirit was signalized by a polyglot *tour de force*, or that Luke, the companion of Paul and the author of Acts, sponsored that tradition. Since I hold the Lucan authorship, my predilections are in favour of the only possible way of escape from an uncomfortable dilemma.

R. E. KER.

Uzuakoli, Nigeria.

This is My Body.

IN *The Parish Communion* (p. 109) Gregory Dix writes: 'These writers believed with all the vigour of St. Justin that the food made Eucharist is (*εἶναι, no word could be stronger*) the Flesh and Blood of that Jesus who was made Flesh.'

Is the ἐστιν at all emphatic? If so, how is it that St. Luke omits it when speaking of the cup? He says τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπερ ὑμῶν διδόμενον, This is my body which is about to be given for you; but he writes without any copula, as Hebrew usually does, about the cup: τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου, τὸ ὑπερ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον. This cup [is] the new covenant in my blood which is poured out for you. In 1 Co 11^{25} St. Paul inserts the ἐστιν. Would Luke omit it if 'nothing could be stronger'?

Again, Jesus presumably spoke in Aramaic, in which the copula is generally omitted. Does anyone know exactly what Jesus said? If He simply said 'This my body . . .', what B. L. Kennett writes in *The Teaching of Scripture* (p. 27) seems very relevant: 'Then we should remember that there is no word in Hebrew equivalent to the English "typifies" or "represents." A Hebrew cannot say, "This typifies such and such a thing"; he is obliged to say, "This *is* such and such a thing." So we find in Isaiah, "The vineyard of the Lord of Hosts *is* the house of Israel"; and

[1] *Adv. Marc.* iii. 8. Cited by Dr. Sydney Cave, *The Doctrine of the Work of Christ*, p. 88.

St. Paul, thinking hebraically, says, "This Hagar *is* Mt. Sinai in Arabia."'

In this connexion our Anglican catechism is subtly evasive. With regard to Baptism it abides by its definition of a sacrament and asks plainly What is the outward sign? and What is the inward grace? But when it comes to the Lord's Supper, instead of asking What is the inward and spiritual grace? the loving sacrificial spirit of our Lord, which He gives in the Lord's Supper to the faithful, it asks, What is the inward part or thing signified? Answer, The Body and Blood of Christ which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.

There is a double symbolism here:

1. The bread and wine symbolize the body and blood of Christ, sacrificed for men in the Crucifixion.

2. The body and blood of Christ dying on the Cross symbolize and show for ever His loving sacrificial and redeeming spirit.

St. John wrote (6^{63}), 'It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken unto you are spirit, and are life.'

The bread and wine symbolize the spirit of Christ. That is the essential thing to receive.

The Early Church was too literal-minded in its interpretation of Christ's words, as was shown by the pagan accusation of cannibalism. In a figure we eat the body of Christ, but when we take it too literally it becomes a lie. As Abraham M. Rihbany says in *The Syrian Christ* (p. 83), 'A Syrian's chief purpose in a conversation is to convey an impression . . . and not to deliver his message in scientifically accurate terms. . . . He speaks as it were in pictures' . . . 'If I fail in fulfilling my promise I will pluck out my right eye'=I do mean what I say; cf. Mt $5^{29.30}$ on which an American minister said, 'If we are true Christians we must not shrink from obeying these *explicit* commands of our Lord'! Or again when a Syrian says, 'This house is [no word could be stronger!] yours. You can burn it if you wish'= 'I am delighted to see you; please make yourself at home.'

To be too literal-minded is a sin against Bible language.

A. B. Johnston.

Welney Rectory, Norfolk.

Entre Nous.

A German Pastor.

An illuminating picture of Christian life and thought in Germany under the Nazis has been given in the *Autobiography of a German Pastor*, by Hans P. Ehrenberg (S.C.M.; 6s. net). The author is a German of Jewish race, a scholar of outstanding ability, who won distinction first as a lecturer in Philosophy and then as a minister of the Confessional Church. A pupil of Naumann, Weber, and Troeltsch, a friend of Niemoeller and Barth he has much of interest to tell of theological developments in Germany during the last half century. Deprived of his Church he was thrown into the concentration camp at Sachsenhausen where Niemoeller was interned, though they were not permitted to see each other. Ehrenberg's grim task was to carry out the dead. After his release he made his way to England where he and his family now reside.

The *Autobiography* is cast in the novel form of letters to individuals who have touched his life at various points, his mother, his wife, his children, to Niemoeller and Karl Barth, also to the Gestapo and to his congregation. These letters are most skilfully woven together to form a readable biography and a penetrating criticism of religious life. To him the present conflict is unmistakably a battle for the Christian Faith. Nazism is essentially a false religion of which Hitler is the prophet. 'Hitler is the resurrected magician of the Middle Ages; he is in league with dark, secret powers; he belongs to them, though for a time he may be able to exercise his power over them. In them are to be found the real resources of the Third Reich, and in order to understand their influence we must recognize their demonic character and expose it; then, after they have been exorcized and exploded, they can be finally dealt with.' The Nazi powers, however they may rage and whatever show of arrogance they may make, are essentially weak and rotten. This becomes manifest in their superstitious fears and the cowardice which will break through. Confronted with a bold Christian confession the Nazi is at a loss. 'He compels us Christians to show that we are ready to sacrifice for our faith; but, when we are prepared to do so and he knows it, he loses his courage, failing to comprehend how anybody can resist his great régime. He thought and still thinks himself invincible. His experiences with a Christian congregation simply do not fit into his scheme: they have irritated him terribly, but have also won his admiration, and often enough have made him uncertain of himself. What we have to do is to find his weak spot, the place where every Nazi is completely rotten; then we are certain of victory.' Ehrenberg sees much to cause grave alarm in the soft and easy-going Christianity of England, and he makes an affectionate appeal for more earnestness and decision. 'In Germany we ignored the neutrals, simply ignored them without any discussion, as we never did the "German Christians." In the same way we must simply repudiate the neutrals in this country, more especially because those things which in Germany tempt men to be neutral are completely lacking over here.' Take one or two samples from this most heart-searching and inspiring book.

Christian Witness.

The spokesman of a miners' deputation which had gone to ask for the release of Niemoeller said to Hitler's personal secretary, 'You have deprived us of freedom of speech above ground but not below ground. You think you can live without Christ: we, down there in the pit, know that we cannot live without Him. Not long ago,' he continued, 'there was an accident in the mine; many of us were killed, among them a father and his son. When we had dug them out we found them lying peacefully on their backs, with their hands folded, and on the coal-face these words were written: "We have died in Jesus Christ." '[1]

Exodus xx. 3.

The superintendent of a girls' labour camp suggested to the girls, Protestant and Roman Catholic, that they should have united services. 'The girls were quite enthusiastic about it. Next Sunday they were directed into the common-room in which stood a table supporting a large picture of Hitler. One of the girls, a Lutheran, ran to the table, seized the picture, and smashed it against the wall, shouting: "Thou shalt have no other gods but me!" . . . The remarkable thing was not that she smashed Hitler's picture, nor even that she had the courage to confess the First Commandment, but that she was *prepared beforehand* to do both.'[2]

Divine Love.

'Even in that sadistic hell, the concentration camp, where peace seemed to be further away than the end of the world, the heart retained its ability to love; to love those who bore with us the mark of pain, and also, under cover of the divine wrath, the enemy himself.

'Since I made this new discovery of love in my heart while I trod the pitiless road of the concentration camp, since I realized through suffering that the hangmen of the camp were the most lost, the most damned of all men, men in whose shoes I would not have stood for a single day; since I perceived my neighbour in the Nazi-murderer and in the criminal inhabitant of the camp—and many have experienced this without giving themselves up to sentimentality and vague talk—since that time I have reached a different understanding of Agape, of that love which operates never because of duty but always spontaneously, and which therefore does not obey a law but bears witness to Grace. This kind of love, which exists beyond all compulsion, has stood in the line of my inner vision for twenty years; but I came to know it most intimately during my five months' detention in the concentration camp.'[3]

Flight to Arras.

Antoine de Saint-Exupéry's *Flight to Arras* is a moving account of the author's hopeless reconnaissance job over Arras in 1940, and, after acceptance of defeat, of his own inward development. Humanism has failed. His faith is in mankind under God.

Humility.

'A chief is a man who assumes responsibility. He says, "I was beaten." He does not say, "My men were beaten." Thus speaks a real man. . . .

'I know the meaning of humility. It is not self-disparagement. It is the motive power of action. If, intending to absolve myself, I plead fate as the excuse for my misfortunes, I subject myself to fate. If I plead treason as their excuse, I subject myself to treason. But if I accept responsibility, I affirm my strength as a man. I am able to influence that of which I form part, I declare myself a constituent part of the community of mankind.

'Thus there is a creature within me against whom I struggle in order that I may rise superior to myself. Except for that flight to Arras I should never have been able to distinguish between that creature and the man I seek to be. . . .

'The kind of truth advanced in verbal bickerings can no longer satisfy me. I know now that the freezing of my controls is not to be explained by the negligence of government clerks, nor the absence of friendly nations at the side of France by the egoism of those nations. It is true that we can explain defeat by pointing to the incapacity of specific individuals. But a civilization is a thing that kneads and moulds men. If the civilization to which I belong was brought low by the incapacity of individuals, then my question must be, why did my civilization not create a different type of individual?'[4]

'My Civilization.'

'Man becomes the man of a country, of a group, of a craft, of a civilization, of a religion. But if we are to clothe ourselves in these higher beings we must begin by creating them within ourselves. The being of which we claim to form part is created within us not by words but only by acts. A being is not subject to the empire of language, but only to the empire of acts. Our Humanism neglected acts. Therefore it failed in its attempt.

'The essential act possesses a name. Its name is sacrifice. . . .

'So long as my civilization leant upon God it was able to preserve the notion of sacrifice whereby God is created in the hearts of men. Humanism neglected the essential rôle of sacrifice. It thought itself able to communicate the notion of Man by words and not by acts. And mankind was meanwhile moving down a dangerous slope—for we were in danger of mistaking the average of mankind or the arithmetical sum of mankind for Man. We were in danger of mistaking the sum of the stones for the cathedral. Wherefore little by little we lost our heritage.'[5]

[1] P. 41. [2] P. 47 f. [3] P. 151 f.

[4] A. de Saint-Exupéry, *Flight to Arras*, 140. [5] *Ib.*, 150.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.